

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 10337) granting a pension to Martha Isabella McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLECZKA: A bill (H. R. 10338) granting a pension to Charles W. Brush; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 10339) for the relief of H. C. Mullins, his wife, and minor children; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 10340) granting an increase of pension to William W. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 10341) to authorize the President of the United States to reappoint Seth William Scofield major of Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 10342) granting a pension to Walter G. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10343) granting an increase of pension to James Braley, alias James Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10344) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Bearden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10345) granting a pension to Belle Cannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Ukrainian National Committee of the United States, Wilmington, Del., and certain citizens of Wilmington, Del., of Ukrainian birth, concerning Ukrainian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of Fremont Council 591, Knights of Columbus, Fremont, Ohio, protesting against withdrawal of war activities of Knights of Columbus from military and naval camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of East Peru, Iowa, relative to the supply of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of Bronx Property Owners and Business Men's Association, urging early action on House bill 3285; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of Ninetieth Division Association, favoring reasonable amount of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Newark Military Service Rifle Club, indorsing plan to establish the Caldwell rifle ranges as permanent Government training grounds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Foster-Milburn & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing Senate bill 2904; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Branch, Ukrainian National Committee of the United States, concerning Ukrainian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of George P. Kimmel, Washington, D. C., regarding conditions in the Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of B. Harris, of New York, urging support of certain foreign trading zone bills, House bills 3170 and 9778; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. Park Love, concerning conditions in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ganss Fur Co. (Inc.) and Gross, Engle & Co., both of New York, opposing House bill 9778; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the joint conference on retirement, civil-service employees of the United States, Washington, D. C., concerning status of House bill 3149; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Lithuanian citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., concerning Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, opposing House bill 8572; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Knights of Columbus of Crookston, Minn., opposing the proposed internationalization of the war-welfare societies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Al-ko Bottling Works, of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring the passage of the Dalling bill, to govern the exportation of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, November 3, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come reverently into Thy presence and lift our hearts to Thee in the name of the millions of our fellow citizens who believe in prayer, who have seen Thy guiding hand, who have known the answer to their prayers and have sought Thy guidance and blessing upon us in our national life. We pray that Thou wilt hear and answer the prayer of Thy people, continuing Thy grace and blessing to us, leading us in the safe way of national greatness and peace and righteousness and establishing in all the earth the great principles upon which Thou hast established this Nation. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, October 30, 1919, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of useless papers devoid of historic interest on the files of the Interior Department and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce in response to a resolution of the 3d ultimo, which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
Washington, October 30, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR: Respectfully referring to Senate resolution No. 203, of October 3, 1919, hitherto acknowledged under date of October 7, permit me to advise as follows:

Attached hereto are five exhibits. Exhibit A gives the detail of the personnel of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which is that service of the Department of Commerce directly engaged in the work of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States. This document gives in detail the names, positions, salaries, and locations of the entire working force of the service.

Exhibit B is a statement showing the plans of the service for utilizing during the present fiscal year the appropriation for promoting commerce, 1919-20. This states the countries in which work is carried on under this appropriation, the commodities being specially studied, and the other features of this particular work. It should be noted that this is entirely separate and distinct from the following items:

Exhibit C states in similar detail to the above the force and work planned under the appropriation for promoting commerce in the Far East, 1919-20.

Exhibit D states in like detail the work planned for the current fiscal year under the appropriation for promoting commerce in South and Central America.

Exhibit E states the way in which the fund of \$300,000 appropriated for commercial attachés is being expended in different countries abroad.

These five documents taken together give a picture of the organization and work of this service. They cover fully the request of the Senate for "detailed statements covering the character, amount, and estimated cost to the Government of such work as is now being carried on under" the auspices of this department.

It should be noted, however, that the work thus described in detail, which is actively progressing all over the globe, is not the only strictly commercial work of the Department of Commerce. In two other services it functions directly in support of the commerce of the country. The Bureau of Standards provides that scientific basis for industry which has until recently been lacking as a necessary support for our trade. Prior to the war Germany greatly excelled in this important respect, and Great Britain is now taking steps to provide the same basic necessity for her own manufactures. The Bureau of Standards is, however, the largest and best equipped laboratory of the kind in the world, and its normal operations form a solid substructure for the development of a scientific basis for our industries.

The Bureau of Fisheries also has been actively creating new industries, such as the aquatic leather industry and the industry of dyeing, dressing, and finishing furs, in both of which respects this country is advanced over others by reason of this particular work. The Bureau of Fisheries also gives earnest and intelligent care to the promotion of food-preserving industries through its fishery products laboratory and has been instrumental in creating new industries in this connection which are on an established and profitable basis.

Both the work of the Bureau of Fisheries and that of the Bureau of Standards contribute in their respective spheres directly and efficiently to the development of our foreign commerce.

In response to the request embodied in the resolution to submit "such suggestions and recommendations" as may look "to the closer cooperation and coordination of the various agencies of the Govern-

ment for effective promotion of the foreign commerce of the United States," I beg respectfully to state as follows:

The basic statute of the United States upon this subject is the organic act of February 14, 1903 (32 Stat., 825), creating the Department of Commerce and Labor. This act provides as follows:

"It shall be the province and duty of said department to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, the labor interests, and the transportation facilities of the United States; and to this end it shall be vested with jurisdiction and control of the departments, bureaus, offices, and branches of the public service hereinafter specified and with such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by law."

So much of the foregoing as relates to labor interests was superseded by the act creating the Department of Labor. The provisions respecting mining and transportation facilities are modified by the respective functions of the Bureau of Mines, of the Department of the Interior, of the Railroad Administration, and of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The same is true as regards shipping through the operations of the Shipping Board. As respects, however, the foreign and domestic commerce, the manufacturing and fishery industries, there has been no modification of the organic act above cited. It remains, indeed, so far as its letter is concerned, quite unreppealed save as respects the labor interests. It is to-day in full force and vigor. There is no other department of the Government broadly charged by law to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, etc., of the United States. It is assumed that this law was meant to be taken seriously; that the duties imposed by it upon the Department of Commerce are real duties, and that it should have the authority as well as the responsibility of performing them. It is perhaps not too much to assume that it was the purpose of Congress that the Department of Commerce, within the sphere which is above outlined, should have the same authority and influence that the Treasury Department has in finance, the War and Navy Departments in their respective fields of military effort, the Agriculture Department in the field of agriculture, the Department of State in diplomacy, and, indeed, each of the other executive departments within its nominal scope.

Such, however, is not the case. Other bodies exist who perform in whole or part duties such as those charged by law upon the Department of Commerce. In writing frankly of the actual situation it should be premised that the matter is not discussed in any spirit of complaint, nor is there thought of criticism of persons or of specific bodies. The subject under review is a matter of organization, and the question being discussed is whether our present organization is fitted to cope effectively with the serious commercial problems that face the country.

Any review of the commercial work of the Government must show that the absence of organization is its most conspicuous feature. There is an excess of organizations; too little system. Numerous bodies exist, functioning in the same field or with direct action or reaction therein, each independent, without coordination, without liaison, without the obligation on the part of any of them to inform the others. In short, there exists in our public commercial organization much the same condition that existed in the allied armies before unity of command was secured. It would not be questioned that before that time the commanders of the allied and associated forces were sincere, competent, and devoted men. Each in his own separate sphere was doing his best and trying to support his allies as fully as he could. Just so it is in our Government commercial organization. Different bodies of able and earnest men function separately on commercial subjects at home and abroad, without mutual plan, without frequent consultation, and often in ignorance of what the others are doing.

The War Finance Corporation is given authority to furnish credits to the extent of a billion dollars "in order to promote commerce with foreign nations." The similarity of the language of this appropriation to that of the organic law of the Department of Commerce is notable. The appropriation is made for the express purpose of doing that with which the Department of Commerce is specifically charged by law. There is no doubt this function will be performed well, so far as the law permits, but there is no obligation to coordinate this work with that of the Department of Commerce, although this last is charged by law to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the country. The management of the War Finance Corporation has shown marked courtesy to the Department of Commerce, but there is no close cooperation.

The Federal Reserve Board admirably performs a function of vital importance to our commerce and finance. One can only speak of it in terms of approval and admiration, but so far as the Department of Commerce is concerned it functions separately, without obligation of either consultation or of cooperation. It is, however, true that the operations of the Federal Reserve Board lie at the very root of the successful operation of our commerce.

The Interstate Commerce Commission performs functions of high value in our domestic and foreign commercial life, but it performs them as a separate organization. It probably does not occur to the distinguished members of that useful body to either consult or cooperate with the Department of Commerce, or that the latter has any interests or functions in common with it, yet the Interstate Commerce Commission may and does vitally affect the foreign commerce of the country through its rate-making powers. The suggestion would probably be strange to them that they should consult the Department of Commerce before taking action which may control the commerce which the Department of Commerce is especially charged to foster, promote, and develop.

The Shipping Board provides for carrying our commerce to the ends of the earth and, through its officers and representatives abroad, takes an important, if not a vital, part in our commercial activity, but the Department of Commerce is not represented upon the Shipping Board and, except as a matter of courtesy, can not influence or guide it. In some of its foreign offices, particularly in London, the work of the Shipping Board along lines of commercial intelligence parallels that of the Department of Commerce, occupies in considerable degree the same field, and indeed the suggestion has been locally made that the information which the officers of the Department of Commerce in London secure should be turned over to the Shipping Board office there for its use. The supercargoes of the Shipping Board, we are informed by that body, are instructed to gather commercial intelligence in all the ports to which they go. They have in the past communicated this information to the Department of Commerce for its use, but there is no obligation to do so. It has been a courtesy on their part.

The Federal Trade Commission has duties of high importance vitally affecting our domestic and foreign trade, but no representative of the Department of Commerce forms a portion of that body, nor is there existing any obligation for that commission to function in close rela-

tion with the Department of Commerce. It will be noted that the Federal Trade Commission is given the supervision over the combinations permitted by law for developing foreign trade. This is a function which falls directly within the organic law of the Department of Commerce.

The International High Commission, of which the Secretary of the Treasury is the ex officio chairman, is a composite body representing the United States and the other American Republics. It has distinctly commercial functions, among them the provision of uniform regulations for commercial travelers, of uniform arrangements for the classification of merchandise, for customs regulations, for consular certificates and invoices, and port charges. It gives special consideration to the protection of patents and trade-marks and deals with the extension of arbitration for adjusting commercial disputes. It is a useful and dignified body, whose work touches closely that of the Department of Commerce. It is in no respect inharmonious, but it is separate. The Department of Commerce has no legal relation to it. A list of its publications is found upon page 59 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, on the Diplomatic and Consular Service appropriation bill, under date of December 11, 1918. It should be noted, however, that as regards trade-marks the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of this department, actively operates in the protection of American trade-marks abroad and maintains a special section occupied in no small part in advising and informing American manufacturers on that subject.

The Railroad Administration, through its power to embargo freights, to grant or remove export rates, may at times exercise a controlling power over both our domestic and foreign commerce, but it has under the law no relation to the Department of Commerce and, save a matter of courtesy, does not assume that there is any joint field of endeavor.

The Department of State, for reasons admitted by all to be good and sufficient, maintains foreign trade advisers and a force for the purpose of gathering foreign trade information. The relation between that department, especially through its Consular Service and the foreign-trade advisers, and the Department of Commerce is intimate and cordial. It has been a privilege to express admiration for the fine and fruitful work of the Consular Service. There is a "no man's land" wherein the diplomatic field runs parallel with the commercial and the commercial field touches closely upon the diplomatic. It will probably always be necessary to maintain a species of joint endeavor between the two departments. There is, however, no duplication of work. The commercial results of the work of the officers of the Department of State are made available through the Department of Commerce and are supplemented and completed, not duplicated, by the work of the officers of the Department of Commerce in the foreign field. The Department of State can never be promotive in a commercial sense. The Department of Commerce can never do diplomatic work. The two fields touch, but they do not cross. They are complementary, not antagonistic. There is no legal requirement at the present time calling for cooperation between the two services, but there is a very generous spirit of cooperation and sincere mutual respect and helpfulness.

The Agricultural Department, through several services, assists or supervises large commercial transactions at home and abroad, and does so ably and with advantage to the country.

Again, let it be emphasized that the relations between these various bodies are not frictional, but cordial. The men comprising the various groups are friends. They realize they are working to a common end. I repeat, the question is not one of individuals but one of organization. There can be no clear-cut commercial policy carried out by separate bodies that do not interfunction. Any industrial organization composed as is the commercial organization of the Government would fall, for the seeds of decay are planted in the very separateness of the component parts. It is not urged that these bodies should cease to be or that their functions should be altered. There are separate duties belonging to each, although many of those duties lie in a common field with the Department of Commerce.

It is, however, strongly urged that each and every one of these separate services, except the Departments of State and Agriculture, should be linked formally to that department which alone the law charges with the duty to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the country.

Is there sound reason why there should not be a representative of the Department of Commerce upon the War Finance Corporation, upon the Federal Reserve Board, upon the Federal Trade Commission, upon the Shipping Board, upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon the International High Commission, or upon the Railroad Administration? If such reason exists, what is it? On the other hand, is it the public purpose and intent that the department charged to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the country should do it only in part, subject to the kindly and unintentional but nevertheless real competition and control of others charged, indeed, with some different duties but acting within the same commercial area?

Either the Department of Commerce should be so organized as to perform its important function effectively or it should not. If it should not do so, then the organic law dictating its functions should be modified and it should cease to be in name what it is hardly in fact, the Department of Commerce. Or, on the other hand, it should be recognized that it is the focus of commercial organization on the part of the Government and as such these various independent bodies should so be headed up into it that the world of commerce at home and abroad may know there is one center for commerce as there is one for agriculture, as there is one for war, as there is one for the Navy, and not a congeries of unrelated parts which operate, indeed, in personal harmony and peace but without those effective results which can come alone from systematic and unified effort.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary of Commerce.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
President the United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A.

Bureau employees:	
Washington	177
Foreign service	105
District offices	32
Total	314

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Country to which assigned and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
Great Britain:			
Commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		\$7,500
Trade commissioner ¹	Brook, H. G.....	July 1, 1918	4,500
Do.....	Gary, L. B.....	Jan. 23, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Grady, H. F.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Page, W. J.....	Sept. 16, 1919	5,000
Do.....	Powell, F. W.....	Feb. 8, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Oseland, Z. C.....	Jan. 25, 1918	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Walker, A. M.....	Mar. 4, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Park, W. M.....	Oct. 1, 1919	2,500
France:			
Commercial attaché.....	Snow, C. D.....	July 1, 1919	7,500
Trade commissioner ¹	Adams, H. W.....	Oct. 1, 1919	4,000
Do.....	Butler, J. F.....	Mar. 27, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Hunt, L. W.....	Aug. 11, 1919	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Breckheimer, P. J.....	Feb. 18, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Masuret, E. A.....	Sept. 2, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Sweetser, H. A.....	Dec. 16, 1918	2,500
Japan:			
Commercial attaché.....	Abbott, J. F.....	Jan. 11, 1919	6,000
Trade commissioner.....	Weimer, J. G.....	July 1, 1919	4,500
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Long, C. V.....	Jan. 25, 1919	1,500
Denmark:			
Commercial attaché.....	Anderson, N. L.....	July 1, 1919	6,500
Trade commissioner.....	Klath, T. O.....	Jan. 27, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	do.....		2,000
Brazil:			
Commercial attaché.....	Philippi, J. E.....	Aug. 15, 1918	7,000
Assistant trade commissioner.....	Counell, R. M.....	Sept. 1, 1919	2,500
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Spain:			
Commercial attaché.....	Jones, C. L.....	Jan. 17, 1919	6,500
Trade commissioner.....	Strachan, W. M.....	Jan. 16, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Vacant.....		3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Cron, L. L.....	July 1, 1919	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Googe, W. D.....	Jan. 27, 1919	2,250
Do.....	Vacant.....		2,000
The Hague:			
Commercial attaché.....	Edwards, P. L.....	Jan. 1, 1918	5,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Radfield, A. H.....	Jan. 17, 1919	3,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vander Laan, J. W.....	Feb. 1, 1919	2,000
Mexico:			
Commercial attaché.....	Feeley, E. F.....	July 7, 1919	6,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	McIntyre, F. P.....	July 26, 1919	1,500
Russia:			
Commercial attaché.....	Huntington, W. C.....	May 1, 1916	5,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Fitzpatrick, J. R.....	Aug. 28, 1919	1,500
Trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	do.....		2,000
China:			
Commercial attaché.....	Arnold, J. H.....	Dec. 30, 1914	8,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Batchelder, C. C.....	Aug. 25, 1919	5,475
Do.....	Meehins, L. W.....	June 16, 1919	4,000
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Leo, C. F.....	June 1, 1917	1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Dormady, F. P.....	Sept. 10, 1919	2,250
Do.....	Smith, R. R.....	July 21, 1919	2,000
Argentina:			
Commercial attaché.....	Klein, Julius.....	May 1, 1919	7,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Brady, G. S.....	Sept. 9, 1919	3,650
Assistant trade commissioner.....	Noll, B. H.....	July 11, 1919	2,500
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Italy:			
Commercial attaché.....	Dennis, A. P.....	Jan. 2, 1919	6,000
Trade commissioner ¹	Chiesa, M. J.....	Jan. 25, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Maclean, H. C.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,650
Clerk to commercial attaché.....	Vacant.....		1,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Hudson, R. G.....	Mar. 5, 1919	2,000
Do.....	Osborne, A. A.....	Feb. 1, 1919	2,500
Belgium:			
Trade commissioner ¹	Collins, H. T.....	Feb. 3, 1919	4,380
Do.....	Herring, C. E.....	June 16, 1918	4,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Prosser, W. L.....	Feb. 3, 1919	2,000
Czechoslovakia:			
Trade commissioner.....	Geringer, V. A.....	Mar. 28, 1919	4,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Jalovec, Louis.....	Apr. 16, 1919	2,000
Switzerland:			
Trade commissioner ²	Groves, H. L.....	Sept. 6, 1919	4,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000
Roumania: Clerk to trade commissioner ¹	Lane, W. E.....	Feb. 4, 1919	2,250
Poland:			
Trade commissioner ²	Van Norman, L. E.....	Oct. 1, 1919	5,000
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000
Norway: Clerk to trade commissioner ¹	Anda, Magnus.....	Feb. 6, 1919	2,000
Australia:			
Trade commissioner.....	Ferrin, A. W.....	Jan. 1, 1919	4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		1,800
Turkey:			
Trade commissioner.....	Mears, E. G.....	Feb. 1, 1919	4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Huse, H. R.....	Feb. 21, 1919	2,250
Austria:			
Trade commissioner ²	Upson, W. F.....	Sept. 29, 1919	4,500
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000
Peru:			
Trade commissioner ²	Jackson, Carlton.....	Sept. 8, 1919	3,650
Clerk to trade commissioner.....	Vacant.....		2,000

¹On duty in United States finishing reports.²Making preparations in United States for departure to post of duty.³Temporary, pending arrival of successor.⁴In United States preparing for departure to post of duty.

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

Territory and position.	Investigation.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
Latin America:				
Trade commissioner	General commercial conditions, Colombia and Venezuela.	Bell, P. L.....	Sept. 23, 1918	\$3,650
Do. ¹	Furniture markets.	Everley, H. E.....	Mar. 12, 1917	3,650
Do. ¹	Construction materials.	Ewing, W. W.....	July 20, 1916	3,650
Do. ¹	Textiles.	Garrv, Louis.....	Dec. 16, 1918	3,650
Do. ¹	Jewelry and silverware.	Rosenthal, S. W.....	June 11, 1917	3,650
Do.....	General commercial conditions, Peru and Bolivia.	Schurz, W. L.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,650
Do. ³	Factory equipment.	Smith, P. S.....	Sept. 8, 1919	5,000
South Africa: Trade commissioner.	General commercial conditions.	Lundquist, R. A.....	Aug. 15, 1916	3,650
Europe:				
Trade commissioner ¹	Lumber markets.	Brown, N. C.....	Apr. 29, 1917	3,650
Do. ¹	do.	Oxholm, A. H.....	Oct. 28, 1916	3,650
Do. ¹	do.	Simmons, R. E.....	Apr. 27, 1917	3,650
Do. ¹	General commercial conditions.	Wells, L. C.....	Mar. 17, 1919	3,650
Do. ¹	Ban dng opportunities.	Young, A. A.....	Jan. 18, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Electrical markets.	Wood, C. P.....	Feb. 3, 1919	4,250
Do.....	General commercial conditions.	Cutler, B. S.....	July 14, 1919	6,000
Do.....	Mining.	DeKalb, C.....	Mar. 1, 1919	4,500
Do.....	Leather.	Hertz, Norman.....	Mar. 4, 1919	3,650
United States:				
Trade commissioner	Commercial conditions.	Harris, Garrard.....	Aug. 29, 1919	3,650
Do.....	Transportation facilities.	Hooker, G. E.....	July 10, 1919	4,000
Expert.....	Stowage of ship cargoes.	Taylor, T. R.....	Sept. 2, 1919	3,000
Trade commissioner	Foreign trade complaints.	Messe, N. S.....	Sept. 20, 1919	1,400
Clerk to trade commissioner.	do.	Cabot, H. V.....	do.....	1,200
Far East:				
Trade commissioner	Mineral resources.	Clements, J. M.....	Mar. 5, 1917	5,475
Do. ²	Advertising methods.	Sanger, J. W.....	Oct. 1, 1919	4,015
Do.....	General commercial conditions, East India and Straits Settlements.	Fowler, J. A.....	Nov. 25, 1918	3,650
Do.....	Industrial machinery.	Rastall, W. H.....	Oct. 30, 1918	5,475
Do. ²	Industrial development of Japan.	Rutter, F. R.....	Oct. 1, 1919	4,000
Do.....	Ports and transportation facilities.	Whitham, P. P.....	Feb. 14, 1917	5,475

¹On duty in United States finishing reports.²In United States preparing for departure to post of duty.

Division or office and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
WASHINGTON OFFICE.			
Director:			
Director of bureau.....	Kennedy, P. B.....	Aug. 1, 1919	\$6,000
Private secretary.....	Vacant.....		1,800
Stenographer.....	Steele, P. W.....	Apr. 2, 1917	1,400
Messenger.....	Johnson, C. N.....	Oct. 11, 1907
First assistant director:			
First assistant director.....	MacElwee, R. S.....	Feb. 1, 1919	3,500
Stenographer.....	Challice, A. M.....	Feb. 17, 1919	1,200
Second assistant director:			
Second assistant director.....	Vacant.....		3,000
Stenographer.....	Steward, Elma.....	Mar. 7, 1917	1,400
Chief clerk:			
Chief clerk.....	Eckhardt, N.....	Aug. 5, 1898	2,250
Assistant chief clerk.....	Dotterer, H.....	Oct. 5, 1914	2,000
Stenographer.....	Towles, E. A.....	Mar. 1, 1915	1,400
Clerk.....	Smith, G. W.....	Aug. 15, 1907	1,400
Stenographer.....	Solomon, G. F.....	Nov. 19, 1917	1,200
Messenger.....	Coleman, Henry.....	Oct. 2, 1896	840
Assistant messenger.....	Shaw, Maudie.....	May 14, 1918	720
Do.....	Page, W. J.....	Mar. 25, 1918	720
Messenger boy.....	Parkinson, L. J.....	Dec. 31, 1918	420
Auditing section—			
Chief of section.....	Haun, H. W.....	Nov. 15, 1911	2,500
Clerk.....	Fehr, Jules.....	Oct. 5, 1914	1,600

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

Division or office and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
WASHINGTON OFFICE—continued.			
Chief clerk—Continued.			
Auditing section—Continued.			
Clerk.....	Johnson, C. C.....	July 19, 1911	\$1,500
Do.....	Guinn, P. S.....	Nov. 20, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Jones, Mae.....	Nov. 4, 1918	1,200
Stenographer.....	De Roche, L. M.....	Nov. 16, 1917	1,200
Clerk.....	Eastman, M. B.....	July 22, 1918	1,000
Files section—			
Clerk in charge.....	Smith, W. F.....	Jan. 17, 1916	1,800
Clerk.....	Worthington, G.....	July 9, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Hughes, Ruth.....	Dec. 1, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Hallan, H. J.....	Aug. 1, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Masi, J. W.....	Nov. 4, 1916	1,200
Do.....	Smith, Helen.....	Aug. 20, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Williams, M. S.....	May 1, 1919	1,000
Distribution section—			
Clerk in charge.....	Naghten, W. A.....	Mar. 20, 1907	1,800
Clerk.....	Toomey, V. R.....	Mar. 19, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Kidwell, L. T.....	Dec. 7, 1914	1,200
Do.....	Corlew, H. J.....	Jan. 21, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Entwistle, M. K.....	Sept. 25, 1918	900
Do.....	Skorup, Joseph.....	June 2, 1919	900
Do.....	DeBirny, A. W.....	Sept. 15, 1919	900
Supplies and printing—			
Clerk in charge.....	Chadwick, A. S.....	Dec. 8, 1909	1,600
Clerk.....	Dillon, R. E.....	Jan. 2, 1919	1,200
Stenographer.....	Flehr, Etteline.....	May 1, 1918	1,200
Assistant messenger.....	Griffin, F. T.....	Jan. 7, 1919	720
Mails—			
Clerk in charge.....	Howard, F. F.....	July 16, 1881	1,400
Clerk.....	Wallace, S. W.....	Aug. 1, 1915	1,000
Assistant messenger.....	Sodars, N. W.....	June 10, 1919	720
Latin American:			
Chief of division.....	McQueen, C. A.....	Sept. 6, 1918	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Blalock, S. H.....	Aug. 10, 1919	2,000
Translator.....	Hole, M. C.....	Sept. 1, 1909	1,800
Do.....	Warren, R. J.....	Nov. 22, 1917	1,400
Clerk.....	Starbird, A. A.....	Mar. 20, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Kirk, Mary.....	Dec. 10, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Frost, B. M.....	Dec. 15, 1917	1,400
Translator.....	Phoebus, M. A.....	Nov. 14, 1917	1,400
Clerk.....	Butterworth, R.....	Mar. 1, 1919	1,300
Stenographer.....	Montz, V. A.....	Oct. 16, 1917	1,200
Clerk.....	Thompson, M. C.....	Mar. 10, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Gaines, E. O.....	Mar. 1, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Bennett, J. L.....	Apr. 8, 1918	1,200
Far Eastern:			
Chief of division.....	Eldridge, F. R.....	Aug. 6, 1918	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Pendergast, R. P.....	Aug. 26, 1919	2,000
Stenographer.....	McKelvey, A. E.....	Jan. 21, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Beery, Mary.....	Oct. 21, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Pugh, M. A.....	Oct. 17, 1919	1,200
Clerk.....	Pauly, E. A.....	Dec. 10, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Nunn, J. H.....	July 1, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Rice, R. K.....	July 17, 1919	900
Do.....	Bodmer, M.....	Aug. 4, 1919	900
District offices:			
Chief of division.....	Vacant.....		
Stenographer.....	Faulkner, Ora.....	Mar. 19, 1917	1,400
Russian:			
Expert.....	Balevsky, B. M.....	Mar. 27, 1919	2,000
Translator.....	Grodzicka, S.....	Mar. 1, 1919	1,400
Stenographer.....	Nelson, M. H.....	Dec. 20, 1918	1,200
Foreign Investigations:			
Chief of division.....	Butler, H. D.....	Apr. 4, 1919	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Breyere, E. J.....	Oct. 5, 1914	1,800
Clerk.....	Fortier, J. A.....	June 9, 1919	1,200
Stenographer.....	Freeman, E. H.....	Jan. 6, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Walton, V. H.....	Dec. 2, 1918	900
Messenger boy.....	Trathen, James.....	Oct. 20, 1919	420
Commercial Attaché:			
Chief of division.....	Stevenson, P. J.....	Nov. 25, 1913	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Miller, W. L.....	Feb. 4, 1919	1,400
Stenographer.....	Murray, H. D.....	Apr. 1, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Goehring, R. E.....	Mar. 17, 1919	1,000
Foreign Tariffs:			
Chief of division.....	Domeratzky, L.....	July 13, 1906	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Moles, O. C.....	Apr. 13, 1915	2,000
Stenographer.....	Frieker, M. H.....	Nov. 6, 1911	1,600
Translator.....	Kendrick, E. M.....	Jan. 13, 1919	1,400
Do.....	Wakefield, R. P.....	July 9, 1917	1,400
Stenographer.....	Gentzler, K. L.....	Feb. 17, 1919	1,000
Research:			
Chief of division.....	Schmeckebier, L. E.....	May 24, 1917	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Robertson, J. A.....	May 11, 1918	2,500
Do.....	Whitney, Ed.....	Aug. 4, 1899	2,250
Commercial economist.....	Kral, J. J.....	July 20, 1911	2,750
Expert in commerce and finance.....	Towles, J. K.....	Jan. 2, 1919	2,000
Research clerk.....	Hoare, H. M.....	Feb. 23, 1912	1,800
Translator.....	Lamore, B. H.....	Jan. 18, 1918	1,800
Do.....	Bowers, Blanche.....	Aug. 1, 1918	1,400
Research clerk.....	Staples, C. L.....	Jan. 7, 1918	1,400
Clerk.....	Batman, M. T.....	Nov. 21, 1918	1,200
Translator.....	Marlowe, A. R.....	July 27, 1918	1,200
Clerk.....	Weems, W. O.....	Sept. 1, 1918	1,200
Stenographer.....	Smith, Sarah.....	Dec. 19, 1918	1,200
Clerk.....	Swift, A. H.....	Nov. 5, 1918	1,000
Laborer.....	Bradley, E.....	Sept. 12, 1912	600
Trade Information:			
Chief of division.....	Brasel, R. H.....	Nov. 5, 1906	2,500
Assistant chief of division.....	Croghan, P. J.....	Aug. 20, 1914	1,800
Correspondence clerk.....	Goldberg, B.....	Feb. 25, 1915	1,600
Do.....	Mallory, W. L.....	May 5, 1919	1,400

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

Division or office and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
WASHINGTON OFFICE—continued.			
Trade Information—Continued.			
Clerk.....	Moore, L. M.....	Jan. 22, 1913	\$1,400
Do.....	Gruber, H. W.....	Apr. 7, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Hughes, L. A.....	Dec. 1, 1917	1,200
Stenographer.....	Lyddans, M. M.....	Nov. 16, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Chappel, A. M.....	July 17, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Roshford, J. S.....	Dec. 16, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Gardner, R.....	Jan. 1, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Gardner, L. G.....	do.....	1,000
Do.....	MacFarland, Alice.....	Nov. 18, 1918	1,000
Clerk.....	Lamitan, R. A.....	July 1, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Fuller, W. S.....	Feb. 7, 1905	1,000
Do.....	Bryant, J. L.....	Dec. 17, 1918	900
Do.....	Carolee Speake.....	July 21, 1919	900
Do.....	Swain, A. M.....	Aug. 27, 1919	900
Statistical:			
Chief of division.....	Hohn, John.....	Feb. 25, 1901	2,500
Do.....	Asmuth, Walter.....	Aug. 1, 1902	2,500
Clerk.....	Sleppy, E. W.....	Mar. 21, 1891	1,800
Do.....	Thrall, J. G.....	Apr. 10, 1901	1,800
Do.....	Daniel, J. W.....	Oct. 2, 1835	1,800
Do.....	Wheeler, C. E.....	Aug. 20, 1910	1,800
Do.....	Cohen, M. H.....	Aug. 16, 1903	1,800
Do.....	Scott, Winfield.....	Jan. 9, 1901	1,800
Do.....	Ingram, Beryl.....	July 23, 1910	1,600
Do.....	Jeffrey, J. H.....	Oct. 10, 1903	1,600
Do.....	Ludwig, E. F.....	Oct. 6, 1902	1,600
Do.....	Grist, B. A.....	July 10, 1907	1,600
Do.....	Daly, P. M.....	Aug. 16, 1901	1,600
Do.....	Black, M. E.....	July 20, 1914	1,600
Do.....	McDuffie, J. A.....	Sept. 17, 1881	1,600
Do.....	Eddingfield, W. T.....	Aug. 17, 1903	1,500
Do.....	Dent, T. M.....	June 1, 1903	1,400
Do.....	Litchfield, F. W.....	Oct. 11, 1903	1,400
Do.....	Welch, B. T.....	Jan. 6, 1874	1,400
Do.....	Young, E. R.....	Jan. 8, 1893	1,400
Do.....	Watson, J. W.....	Apr. 3, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Scott, W. H.....	Sept. 12, 1901	1,200
Do.....	O'Connor, John.....	Apr. 23, 1917	1,200
Do.....	McRae, V. E.....	Aug. 1, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Schmeckel, T.....	Sept. 23, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Thomson, G. H.....	Jan. 16, 1880	1,200
Do.....	Du Bois, A. W.....	Sept. 27, 1914	1,200
Do.....	Rice, E. J.....	Nov. 7, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Mann, E. A.....	Dec. 31, 1918	1,200
Stenographer.....	Duffy, E. E.....	Aug. 29, 1918	1,000
Clerk.....	Fowler, L. H.....	Mar. 27, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Hiner, I. M.....	Oct. 23, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Turner, Jettie.....	Aug. 6, 1919	900
Do.....	Batcheller, E. L.....	Sept. 15, 1919	900
Editorial:			
Chief of division.....	Hopkins, O. P.....	Apr. 18, 1911	2,500
Editorial assistant.....	Evans, Griffith.....	Sept. 21, 1909	2,000
Expert editor.....	Collier, J. H.....	July 16, 1916	2,000
Editor.....	Peirce, F. L.....	Mar. 22, 1916	1,800
Do.....	Hopkins, I.....	Nov. 3, 1913	1,800
Do.....	Cain, M. D.....	July 7, 1903	1,800
Clerk.....	Lille, J. H.....	Oct. 21, 1907	1,600
Editor.....	Gunn, Miriam.....	July 14, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Kavanaugh, K.....	June 23, 1918	1,400
Do.....	Piper, D. E.....	Feb. 1, 1919	1,400
Clerk.....	Greenfield, Cora.....	July 15, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Strocker, A. W.....	Aug. 16, 1916	1,200
Do.....	Myers, Ruth.....	Oct. 9, 1918	1,200
Editor.....	Darlington, L. C.....	Apr. 17, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Collins, J. B.....	Jan. 16, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Bowers, E. C.....	Apr. 2, 1919	1,000
Clerk.....	Blakeney, A. E.....	June 20, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Ash, W. O.....	Oct. 3, 1919	900
District offices in United States and position.			
New York:			
District office manager.....	Clark, A. R.....	Feb. 1, 1919	\$4,000
Commercial agent.....	Barnard, A. J.....	May 15, 1919	2,500
Do.....	Zwickel, E. M.....	Dec. 16, 1919	1,600
Do.....	Bauer, G. F.....	May 28, 1919	1,400
Clerk.....	Hutchinson, A. E.....	Aug. 21, 1916	1,400
Do.....	Bennett, F. D.....	Nov. 19, 1917	1,400
Do.....	Marcus, J.....	May 8, 1919	1,400
Do.....	Schwing, C. A.....	July 20, 1916	1,400
Do.....	Turner, H. L.....	Apr. 22, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Friedland, R.....	July 2, 1917	1,000
Do.....	Meyer, I. M.....	Jan. 20, 1919	1,000
Do.....	Galvin, F. E.....	Feb. 5, 1919	1,000
Messenger boy.....	Schwenger, E. W.....	Jan. 21, 1918	600
Boston:			
District office manager.....	Fuller, T. J. D., jr.....	Mar. 8, 1913	3,000
Clerk.....	Donohue, M. C.....	Mar. 12, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Greene, F. A.....	Oct. 16, 1917	1,200
Do.....	Duffy, M. A.....	May 1, 1918	1,000
Chicago:			
District office manager.....	Stancill, R. L.....	June 1, 1919	3,000
Commercial agent.....	Kunming, P. W.....	Feb. 3, 1919	1,400
Clerk.....	Lydon, T. A.....	Nov. 19, 1918	1,000
Do.....	Worsley, A. R.....	Oct. 16, 1918	1,000
Seattle:			
District office manager.....	Vacant.....		3,000
Clerk.....	Sealey, H. D.....	Feb. 11, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Ayers, L.....	Jan. 18, 1919	1,000

Personnel of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Continued.

District offices in United States and position.	Name.	Date of appointment.	Salary.
San Francisco:			
District office manager.....	Babbitt, E. G.....	Apr. 13, 1915	\$3,000
Clerk.....	de Navarro, C.....	Feb. 1, 1919	1,200
Do.....	Costello, M.....	Apr. 7, 1919	1,200
St. Louis:			
District office manager.....	Gaukel, T. L.....	Feb. 1, 1919	2,000
Clerk.....	Hartnett, J. M.....	July 22, 1918	1,200
New Orleans:			
District office manager.....	Thompson, E. W.....	Oct. 1, 1919	3,000
Clerk.....	Husson, H. C.....	Mar. 1, 1918	1,200
Do.....	Dieck, A.....	May 6, 1919	1,000

EXHIBIT B.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for promoting commerce, Department of Commerce, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

General commercial studies:	
England.....	\$9,650
Italy.....	2,250
Netherlands.....	5,750
Norway.....	3,050
France.....	2,750
Switzerland.....	7,475
Maintaining trade commissioners:	
Australasia.....	9,700
Belgium.....	16,700
Czechoslovakia.....	11,450
Denmark.....	8,900
France.....	16,175
Italy.....	11,400
Poland.....	9,775
Roumania.....	2,800
Spain.....	13,400
The Levant.....	11,400
United Kingdom.....	17,350
Austria.....	8,850
India.....	7,600
Germany.....	6,200
South Russia.....	7,100
Commodity investigation:	
Agricultural implements, France.....	1,280
Banking and currency, Spain.....	2,325
Electrical goods, Italy.....	1,550
Electrical goods, Spain.....	1,000
Industrial machinery, France.....	3,500
Industrial machinery, Italy.....	1,150
Leather and raw stock.....	1,500
Lumber markets and industry.....	5,885
Machine tools.....	1,000
Mineral resources, Spain.....	4,850
Transportation and inland waterways.....	5,850
Promoting interest in foreign trade in the Southern States.....	5,000
Investigation and adjusting commercial complaints.....	2,500
Shipping investigation.....	85
Special investigation.....	5,000
Electrical goods.....	8,600
Report on shipping.....	1,250
Industrial machinery.....	3,000
District office service:	
New York.....	22,250
Boston.....	7,200
Chicago.....	7,000
St. Louis.....	4,650
Seattle.....	5,100
San Francisco.....	5,100
New Orleans.....	6,850
Miscellaneous:	
Temporary travel and other special service.....	9,000
Contingent expenses.....	6,500
Total appropriation.....	325,000

EXHIBIT C.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for pro-1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

General commercial studies:	
Shanghai.....	\$11,000
Peking.....	9,000
Dutch East Indies.....	7,700
Tokyo.....	8,000
Commodity investigations:	
Advertising methods.....	\$7,000
Industrial machinery.....	6,000
Mineral resources.....	9,300
Ports and transportation.....	12,800
Miscellaneous:	
Administration and office force in Washington.....	20,000
Contingent expenses.....	4,000
Temporary travel and other special services.....	2,500
Reserved for contingencies.....	2,700
Total appropriation.....	100,000

EXHIBIT D.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for promoting commerce, South and Central America, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

General commercial studies:	
Argentina.....	\$9,415
Brazil.....	4,750
Colombia and Venezuela.....	7,500
Paraguay and Bolivia.....	7,300
West Indies.....	3,500
Peru.....	8,265
Commodity investigations:	
Advertising methods.....	1,500
Construction materials.....	3,325
Factory equipment.....	7,600
Furniture markets.....	2,600
Jewelry markets.....	3,000
Leather and raw stock.....	6,250
Textiles.....	3,500
Banking and finance.....	3,125
Miscellaneous:	
Administration and office force in Washington.....	20,000
Temporary travel and other special services.....	3,000
Contingent expenses.....	3,000
Reserve for contingencies.....	2,270
Total appropriation.....	100,000

EXHIBIT E.

Activities being conducted and those contemplated by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce under the appropriation for commercial attachés, Department of Commerce, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

ESTIMATED COST FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.

Foreign field stations:	
The Hague, Netherlands.....	\$10,300
Buenos Aires, Argentina.....	12,200
Copenhagen, Denmark.....	11,700
London, England.....	11,900
Madrid, Spain.....	11,950
Mexico City, Mexico.....	10,450
Paris, France.....	11,650
Peking, China.....	14,800
Petrograd, Russia (provisionally).....	11,100
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.....	11,250
Rome, Italy.....	11,750
Santiago de Chile, Chile (provisionally).....	10,000
Tokyo, Japan.....	9,200
Lima, Peru.....	8,200
Miscellaneous:	
Contingent expenses.....	6,000
Temporary travel and other special services.....	2,550
Total appropriation.....	185,000

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Director General of Railroads in response to a resolution of the 3d ultimo, which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 31, 1919.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of resolution of the Senate of the United States (S. 203), dated October 3, 1919, requesting certain information in regard to the activities of the United States Railroad Administration in connection with the foreign commerce of the United States.

The Railroad Administration has endeavored to assist in the restoration of the movement of foreign traffic by the application of reasonable rates, rules, and regulations, such as are consistent with present conditions. To assist in determining what property might be done, it has conferred with and secured data from various departments of the Government and worked with them in that manner to cooperate in fostering, promoting, and developing the foreign commerce of the United States. The Railroad Administration is represented on the economic liaison committee organized by the Department of State.

There is no assigned division or department of the Railroad Administration devoted to the fostering, promoting, and developing of foreign commerce.

The Railroad Administration is not involved directly in the gathering of data used or the expense incident thereto, but only in the proper transportation of the traffic as developed and offered for shipment within the United States. A great many railroad employees who are generally engaged in the handling of traffic are, to an extent, involved in the handling of import and export traffic; it is an incident of the general business of the carriers. The foreign freight agents employed on the individual railroads are employed in facilitating the transfer, including the necessary customhouse business, of traffic between the ocean carriers and the inland rail carriers, their functions being performance of service rather than primarily the fostering, promoting, and development of foreign commerce. They are a part of the organization maintained by the railroad corpora-

tions prior to Federal control, which will doubtless be maintained by such corporations after the termination of Federal control.

Very truly, yours,

WALKER D. HINES,
Director General of Railroads.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

USELESS PAPERS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commission, requesting action looking to the disposition of useless papers devoid of historic interest on the files of the commission. The communication will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2883) authorizing the Meridian Highway Bridge Co., a corporation, to construct and maintain a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between Yankton County, S. Dak., and Cedar County, Nebr.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 425) to establish the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, and Mr. HAYS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2775) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, Mr. ELSTON, Mr. FERRIS, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1024. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo.;

H. R. 3258. An act for the relief of Julius Jonas;

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveract Breitung* to *T. K. Maher*;

H. R. 7030. An act for the relief of Martin Goldsmith; and

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3258. An act for the relief of Julius Jonas; and

H. R. 7030. An act for the relief of Martin Goldsmith.

H. R. 1024. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveract Breitung* to *T. K. Maher*, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram from the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, of Detroit, Mich., which will be inserted in the RECORD.

The telegram is as follows:

[Telegram.]

DETROIT, MICH., November 1, 1919.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

The executive committee of the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association desires to express through you to the Senate of the United States its unqualified approval of the Senate's courageous and praiseworthy action in the support given to the President's position touching the pending coal strike. This association represents in a very large way the retail lumber industry of America, which comprehends in the neighborhood of 70,000 retail lumber yards. In session to-day we have

made a careful survey of the results of the strike as it will affect our industry, and we wish to call your attention to the fact that an interrupted supply of coal at this time will very materially interfere with not only the manufacture but the distribution of the large supply of lumber which is now called for by the people of this country for the purpose of furnishing shelter and homes so urgently needed. The need of the hour is that those in authority shall uphold the laws of the land and our constitutional institutions.

NATIONAL RETAIL LUMBER DEALERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have before me a petition signed by, I believe, some 67 merchants of the city of Dayton and vicinity in the State of Ohio in support of the Kenyon bill. It seems that heretofore these petitioners signed a memorial protesting against the bill. I ask that the petition be incorporated in the RECORD without the signatures and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1919.

TO OUR SENATORS:

We, the undersigned merchants of Dayton and vicinity, favor a measure to subject the big meat packers to regulation similar to that provided by the Kenyon bill. We are opposed to the existing monopoly of meat products, cheese, etc., and we believe that this monopoly should be regulated. We understand that the Kenyon bill provides for Government regulation, but not ownership or operation; that it allows the present owners to operate their plants so long as their operations are fair, nondiscriminatory, and competitive; that it provides for the separate operation of stockyards; and that it puts private refrigeration lines on a common-carrier basis. We desire hereby to withdraw any petitions, letters, or telegrams in opposition to the Kenyon bill to which our names may have been affixed, for the reason that our former action was taken without an understanding of the contents of the bill and at the request of the packers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Georgia memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby Okefenokee Swamp may be made a national park reservation. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, S. G. McLendon, secretary of state of the State of Georgia, do hereby certify that the matter hereto attached is a true copy of a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby the Okefenokee Swamp may be made a national park reservation, and for other purposes, approved August 18, 1919, as the same appears of file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of my office at the capitol, in the city of Atlanta, this 29th day of October, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-fourth.

S. G. MCLENDON,
Secretary of State.

A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby the Okefenokee Swamp, in the southern section of the State of Georgia, may be made a national park reservation, and for other purposes.

Whereas the Okefenokee Swamp, located in the southern section of the State of Georgia, containing an area of about 700 square miles, in which the St. Marys River and the famous Suwanee of song and story take their source, and in which there is found so much to attract the sportsman, as its hommocks and jungles teem with wild animals and game of every description native to North America, its lakes and creeks and rivers abound in fish, and its open forests ring with the music of native bird life; and

Whereas no place in all the southeastern section of the United States offers more to the student of wild life than this swamp. Here, preserved because of its inaccessibility, remains much of the primeval life of America. No place in all the southeastern section of our country, in that vast area bounded on the north by the Potomac and Ohio Rivers and on the west by the Mississippi, contains so many different species of birds as are native to this swamp; and

Whereas here in tangled leaf and wild flower live a great many of our songsters who have escaped the destruction that awaited them elsewhere. Here, too, are some of the largest birds, going up the scale and reaching the largest eagles in this section. Here are found a few species that practically are found nowhere else; and

Whereas in this jungle also remain much of our wild game, here the bear and southern lynx can be found, the only place in this territory in which black bear exists, except in some canebrakes in isolated spots along our great rivers; and

Whereas no section is so rich in its attraction to the students as this section, and here he can reap the satisfaction of seeing many species of both bird and animal life in fairly abundant quantities that are extremely rare, if not almost extinct; and

Whereas the swamp is equally as rich for the careful student in the study of fish life; here are found a very great variety of our freshwater fish; in fact, in a narrow compass of waters are found more varieties than any other similar area. The fish that inhabit our still waters of sluggish habits here live and thrive in long lagoons and lakes. Here at many points the waters, as they meet to make the head of both the St. Marys and Suwanee Rivers, form an ideal spot for the life of some of our game fish; and

Whereas in all the Northwest and in the Southwest sections of the United States great areas have been purchased and set apart so that the people there might have a place in which to go to see the life that has disappeared forever from the plains and forests and mountains of the far West, the National Government having purchased seven great parks to carry out this work; and

Whereas here in the Southeast no friendly hand has been held out to help us in preserving for future generations the wild life that once existed in this section of the United States. Nature herself worked

hard and furnished here a natural sanctuary. Commerce has come in now and the ax of the lumberman is heard all throughout the swamps, and the coverts for game, the dense jungles in which birds and animals hide themselves from danger, will disappear unless protected, and the great forest, jungle, and swamp which form the headquarters of the two great rivers will disappear unless steps are taken to preserve same: Therefore

The House of Representatives of Georgia (the Senate concurring), do resolve:

First. That our Senators and Representatives from Georgia in Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, memorialized to have the Congress enact appropriate legislation whereby the Okefenokee Swamp may be made a national park reservation.

Second. That duly certified copies of these preambles and resolutions be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state upon the passage, approval, and filing of same in his office to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States.

JNO. N. HOLDER, *Speaker of House.*
E. B. MOORE, *Clerk of House.*
SAM L. OLIVE, *President of Senate.*
DEVEREAUX F. MCCLATCHEY,
Secretary of Senate.

Approved August 18, 1919.

HUGH M. DORSEY, *Governor.*

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I also present a resolution adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta, Ga., October 15-16, 1919, urging investigation and remedial legislation in the matter of training and pay allowed disabled service men resulting from the World War. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION, GEORGIA DIVISION,
Atlanta, Ga., October 21, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is transmitted herewith a copy of resolution adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta, October 15-16, 1919, urging an investigation and remedial legislation in the matter of training and pay allowed disabled service men resulting from the World War.

This is sent to you pursuant to the text of the resolution, and it is urged that you give the matter your careful consideration.

Yours, very truly,

BASIL STOCKBRIDGE,
State Chairman.

Be it resolved by the Georgia Division of the American Legion in State convention assembled, That the Congress of the United States be urged to appoint a commission to investigate the method of training disabled service men of the World War, as same is given under the present laws, and to further investigate the pay allowed to disabled service men who are taking advantage of said training, and to further investigate the compensation that is being paid to disabled men, and in case deficiencies are found as a result of said investigation that appropriate legislation be passed to remedy said deficiencies immediately; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the two Senators and to each of the Representatives from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present a resolution adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta, Ga., October 15-16, 1919, urging that Congress enact a law amending the present war-risk insurance act so that premiums may be collected by post-office employees. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
GEORGIA DIVISION,
Atlanta, Ga., October 21, 1919.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is transmitted herewith copy of resolution unanimously adopted by the State convention of the American Legion, held in Atlanta on October 15-16, 1919, urging that Congress enact a law amending the present war-risk insurance act so that premiums may be collected by post-office employees.

It is urged that this matter receive your earnest consideration.

Very respectfully,

BASIL STOCKBRIDGE,
State Chairman.

Be it resolved, and it is hereby resolved, by the Georgia Division, American Legion, in convention assembled, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Georgia in the Congress of the United States be requested to introduce and urge the passage of legislation by the Congress which would authorize the receipt by postmasters and rural mail carriers of premiums upon war-risk insurance policies, it being the belief of this convention that authority to make payments of premiums upon policies to postal authorities will prevent the dropping of policies of men who are not familiar with methods of making remittance by mail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD certain resolutions intended to operate as petitions to the Senate in behalf of the help of the American Government to the people of Armenia.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at its annual meeting in Grand Rapids October 23, 1919.

In view of the 100 years of philanthropic service to all the people of Turkey and the large investment of life and property made by the people of America through the Christian Church; in view of the present crisis, threatening not only the continuance of this humanitarian service but the very existence of the people for whom it was established; and in view of the fact that the United States is the only one of the great powers which is in a position to render this service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That it is the earnest conviction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, assembled in Grand Rapids, Mich., that action immediately be taken by the United States to protect the people of Armenia such as is contemplated by the Williams resolution now before the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this our resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the leaders of the majority and minority parties in the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to correspond with the churches of our denomination to the end that they should urge this action upon their several representatives in the United States Senate.

On October 24 the National Council of Congregational Churches passed the same motion, substituting its name in place of that of the American board in the second paragraph and omitting the fourth paragraph.

The committee of the American board was appointed by President Edward C. Moore on October 23, as follows: President Henry C. King, Rev. James L. Barton, Mr. Franklin Warner, Rev. William Horace Day, Mr. John M. Whitehead, Rev. William E. Barton, Mr. H. M. Beardsley, Rev. Robert E. Browne, Judge John H. Perry, Mr. William E. Sweet, Rev. Ernest W. Riggs (chairman).

ARMENIAN NATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA, RICHMOND BRANCH.

Resolution on behalf of Armenia.

Whereas, in spite of the fact that almost a year has passed since the signing of the armistice, the Armenian people continue to suffer, as before, all the horrors of famine, homelessness, violence, murder, persecution, exile, and imminent massacre; and Whereas thousands of Armenian women and girls are still enslaved by Kurdish, Turkish, and Arab masters; and Whereas the Armenians are now practically without means of defending themselves, while the Turks, Kurds, and Tartars are equipped with arms, and emboldened by the lax attitude of the powers, are threatening to combine in an attack upon the Armenian Republic and upon all the Armenians of Transcaucasia; and

Whereas outrageous situations of this kind have always been abhorrent to the American people; and

Whereas America entered the war for the express purpose of putting an end to them; and

Whereas there are now before the Senate two bills, one the Lodge bill, in favor of an independent Armenia, and the other, the Williams bill, referring directly to the present crisis, and recommending that we lend to Armenia some kind of military aid; and

Whereas throughout the war the Armenian people were true and valiant allies, the first and the last in the defense of the Caucasian front: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Armenian colony of Armenian National Union of America assembled in Richmond, Va., believing that to refuse aid to this heroic people at this time would be to betray the principles for which our men fought and died and to incur a lasting national dishonor, do hereby urge upon the Senate the adoption of such resolution as shall afford to the Armenian people immediate protection; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Senator LODGE, Senator HARDING, Senator WILLIAMS, Senator NEW, and to the President and Vice President.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolutions adopted by the Richmond Branch of the Armenian National Union of America on October 27, 1919.

K. DER KRIKOSIEN,
*Secretary Richmond Branch of
Armenian National Union of America.*

We, the undersigned citizens of the city of Richmond, Va., heartily indorse the above resolutions.

[Copy of original signatures sent to President Wilson:]

George Ainslie, mayor; W. Russell Bowie, rector St. Paul's Episcopal Church; D. C. Richardson, judge; R. Carter Scott, judge; E. Randolph Williams; D. S. Freeman, editor News-Leader; James W. Morris, rector Monumental Episcopal Church; E. Raleigh Phillips; Alex. Ryland; Wm. C. Camp, American National Bank; City officials: Geo. Wayne Anderson, W. M. Winston, R. L. Hasker, W. R. McLaughlin, R. W. White, J. F. Waller, Thos. M. Landers, sr., S. M. Baughan, C. E. Hayward, Marie C. Daly, Hattie C. Crist, Celute J. Barrow, Mattie E. Campbell, Winifred P. Moxon, E. G. Friend, Bessie E. Irving, Gay B. Shepperson, Alice E. Hopkins, Abe Cohn, C. Upsher Creery, S. C. Hardin, J. E. Burnett, Beverley T. Crump, L. L. Cheatwood, Wm. Reinhard, A. Van Buren, J. H. Lawder, Geo. W. Libby, J. R. Perdue, jr., G. H. Tompkins, Louis C. Gissler, H. E. Treson, W. L. Tyler, Cleat Walke, Stuart Bowe, Wm. H. Wyatt, jr., W. J. Griggs, C. M. Smith, Jr., H. C. Cofer, Chas. I. Phillips, Luther Libby, Thos. Haddon, William E. Smith, J. Geter Jones, Merchants Bank; Government officials: Walter D. Melton, Harry Wood, Chas. B. Reid, W. A. Grant, Claude A. Hess, Howard L. Melton, John W. Arnold, Harrison S. Hall, A. D. Fenson, R. J. Rowlett, Vara H. Winston, R. Lew Phillips, Douglas Baird, Elmo S. Redwood, Ed. E. Bernard, F. W. Kenker, Walter S. Doughty, J. Harrison Tabb, William R. Vial, jr., W. B. Allen, W. T. Miles, G. Gordon Brown.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD certain resolutions from the Council of Jewish Women in favor of the unqualified ratification of the treaty of peace and the league of nations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK SECTION,
COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,
October 23, 1919.

Senator JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a large open meeting of the New York section of the Council of Jewish Women, held on October 23, 1919, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas the league of nations presents the only hope of universal and lasting peace and of ultimate disarmament; and

"Whereas the league of nations would establish peace on the high moral plane of justice and freedom to weak nations as well as to strong; and

"Whereas the safety and liberty of our country are in every way protected by this covenant; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the New York Section of the Council of Jewish Women, consisting of 3,600 citizens, in meeting assembled, indorse the covenant of the league of nations; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to every member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and to each of the Senators from New York State."

Very truly, yours,

Mrs. IRVING LEHMAN,
Chairman Committee on Legislation.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of Thomas Francis Meagher Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Anaconda, Mont., remonstrating against the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Arlington Women's Union Club, of Bangor, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 2743, United Mine Workers of America, of Ringo, Kans., favoring the wage demands of miners in the pending coal strike and expressing their loyalty to the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 411) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1233) to repeal an act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the act amendatory thereof, reported adversely thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3090) to repeal the espionage act, reported adversely thereon.

SUGAR SHORTAGE.

Mr. McNARY. On behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably the bill (S. 3284) to provide for the national welfare by continuing the United States Sugar Equalization Board until December 31, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 286) thereon.

Mr. RANDELL. I ask for 24 hours in which to prepare and file the views of the minority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted. The bill reported by the Senator from Oregon will be placed on the calendar.

MINNESOTA RIVER DAM.

Mr. NELSON. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3263) to authorize the construction of flood control and improvement works in Minnesota River and Big Stone Lake between the States of Minnesota and South Dakota, and I submit a report (No. 284) thereon. The bill is recommended by the department. It gives consent to the local authorities to erect a dam. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota if North Dakota is not included?

Mr. NELSON. It will be included, I suppose, ultimately in the waterworks. This is for a dam at the foot of Big Stone Lake, between Minnesota and South Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the bill may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Minnesota Valley Drainage and Flood Control District, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, and the Big Stone Lake Drainage and Flood Control District, organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Dakota, are

hereby authorized to construct a dam across Minnesota River at the foot of Big Stone Lake, together with such dikes, spillways, diversion channels, and other works in said river and lake as the said districts may agree upon as necessary for the prevention and control of floods, the improvement of navigation, and the drainage of land: *Provided*, That plans for the works hereby authorized shall be submitted to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers for their approval, and unless and until approved by them no part of the said works shall be built or commenced.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOWN-SITE ALLOTMENTS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. SPENCER. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 7751) authorizing the sale of inherited and unpartitioned allotments for town-site purposes in the Quapaw Agency, Okla., and I submit a report (No. 285) thereon.

Mr. OWEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It relates merely to the drainage of a very small section in the Ottawa country where a town has been built up in the zinc fields. It is purely a local matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read before consent is given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, upon the application heretofore or hereafter made, of a majority in interest of the owners of any inherited and unpartitioned allotment in the Quapaw Agency, Okla., to sell the surface of said allotted lands, in whole or in part, for town-site purposes, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, concerning terms of sale and disposal of the proceeds for the benefit of the respective Indians: *Provided*, That any duly authorized representative of the Interior Department may execute any deed or other instrument necessary to the completion of such sale in the name and on behalf of any of the owners of said land if such owner or his legal representative shall fail or refuse to execute such deed or other instrument for a period of 30 days after being given notice in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe that such deed or other instrument is ready for execution.

In conducting such sale the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, prescribe such conditions and requirements as may be necessary for the protection of any person or persons he may find to have legal or equitable interests in any of said lands or the improvements thereon, making due allowance, in his discretion, for the value of such improvements, but no preference right to purchase any lot or tract shall be accorded any person for a period exceeding 90 days.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to cover the expense of conducting such sale, such sum to be reimbursed to the Treasury out of the proceeds of the sale and to be apportioned among the distributees of the fund derived from the sale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3357) to provide funds for continuing work upon existing projects already authorized by the act of June 17, 1902, and subsequent acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, known as the reclamation law; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 3358) fixing the ages for appointment of officers who have served in the Reserve Corps during the war with the Imperial German Empire to a relative rank in the Regular Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3359) to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3360) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3361) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda C. Doney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3362) for the relief of the Jefferson Lime Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3363) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 3364) to provide increased compensation for employees of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 3365) for the relief of Hilbert A. C. Jensen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 3366) granting a pension to Harry B. Robb; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3367) for the erection of a public building in the city of Stillwater, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3368) to provide for aeroplane mail service between New York City, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) making November 11 of each year a national holiday, to be known as Liberty Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not usually take very much time in the morning hour, but I ask unanimous consent of the Senate at this time for about 15 or 20 minutes to submit some remarks with reference to a bill which I propose to introduce relating to shipping.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington will proceed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, when the World War began we had 1,076,152 gross tons of shipping out of nearly 50,000,000 tons engaged in the world's trade. It was carrying only about 10 per cent of our foreign commerce. Then was brought home to us the need of a great nation for a merchant marine. Foreign shipping upon which we were dependent was taken for war purposes. Our products and goods could not be exported for lack of ships. Charter rates became excessive, many of our industries were prostrate, and our people were threatened with ruin. The loss actually suffered was more than would have been required to secure an adequate merchant marine under proper governmental encouragement.

When we entered the war in 1917 our foreign tonnage had increased to 2,191,715 tons under the impetus of war needs. Then it was that our protective coastwise policy was fully justified. It is safe to say that the war was really won by our coastwise merchant marine, which then amounted to 6,277,934 tons. Many of the best ships available for transporting troops, munitions, and supplies were coastwise ships which we would not have had except for the policy followed for the protection of our coastwise shipping from foreign competition. It saved us and the Allies from defeat, or helped us to an early victory.

As it was, our power was greatly impaired by the lack of ships. Men and supplies were to be taken over water thousands of miles. Ships had to be secured at any cost or militarism would be triumphant, our flag dishonored, and liberty lost to the world for generations. Over three billions of dollars were appropriated by Congress for ships. This is more than the book value of all the merchant ships of the world in 1914 and a heavy price to pay for the neglect of years.

No one knew how long the war would last. A shipbuilding program for a two or more years' war was begun and carried on until victory came. After the armistice many contracts were canceled, and the program will likely be completed by December 31, 1920. By the end of next year we will have, including our coastwise shipping, a merchant fleet of almost 18,000,000 gross tons, and about equal to that of the British Empire.

We do not desire, and it is not our purpose, to drive other nations off the sea, but we do want to do, and we ought to do, at least our proportionate part of our own and the world's carrying trade, so that our commerce shall have a fair chance in the world's markets, and that we may be hereafter fully prepared for any emergency that may confront us. In my judgment, the people are ready to do anything needed to bring this about.

Our ships have been built in a hurry. Many are not the best for our trade. We have too many of some kinds and none of others. The fleet should be properly balanced and then we should maintain it on a par with commercial growth and keep it up to the highest state of efficiency. If any nation seeks to drive us off the sea, we should meet such an attempt with all our resources. If our right to have and operate a merchant marine commensurate with our wealth, commerce, and power is admitted by other nations, it will be well for them and for us. The need of the British Empire of a great merchant marine is admitted by

us; but it is not good that the world should depend upon one nation for its water transportation. The world's peace is not safe or assured under such a condition. We are the greatest exporting Nation in the world, and the second, if not the first, importing Nation, and we should be no more dependent upon foreign transportation to get our products to market than should any other nation.

Of the 12,000,000 tons of shipping for the foreign trade that will be under our flag by the close of next year, more than 8,000,000 will be owned by the Government and paid for by taxes from the people. What to do with it and how to use it is the problem that confronts us, and it should be solved as soon as possible.

We may differ about Government ownership, but that can be no issue here. The Government owns these ships, whether we will or no. They can not be given away. The people will not stand for that. We must not allow private parties to take the cream of this shipping and let the Government hold the balance to dispose of at a great sacrifice. Grant that Government ownership should end as soon as may be; it must be brought about as nearly as may be without unnecessary sacrifice and just as a private individual would get rid of property he did not desire to keep but that he did not have to dispose of at a sacrifice. Furthermore, the Government is interested in the future success of shipping and the maintenance of a permanent fleet. That object must be kept in view, and in getting rid of Government ownership we must try not to sacrifice our property and must strive also to build up and put our shipping on a permanent basis. In fact, the ultimate purpose of our legislation should be the establishment of a policy under which an adequate merchant marine will be developed and maintained under private ownership and operation.

Private interest, incentive, and energy bring the greatest efficiency. Efficiency means success—its absence, failure—in business and enterprise. When any of these ships can be sold so as to promote the ultimate purpose they should be sold. If not sold, they should be operated privately when this can be arranged for on fair terms and in a way to promote the ultimate purpose.

No one can reasonably hope that private enterprise and capital, in the face of foreign competition and handicapped by our own inexperience and lack of business connections and facilities, will be able to absorb and take over all this shipping in a short while and establish the routes we ought to have. To serve our present needs, establish and maintain new lines, and develop the new markets that we must have if our merchant marine is to be what it ought to be, additional ships of special type, size, and speed must be built. They will cost large sums of money. Some may be built by private capital, but in my judgment most of them will have to be built by the Government if we are to have them. They can be built without new appropriations and as a part of a policy that will not only cost the Government nothing but will help repay what has already been spent. Along with the ships we have we also have agencies to build the ships we need. It is economy to use them, even if the additional cost of a ship may be a little more—which I very much doubt. At Camden, N. J., for example, the Government has a plant for the building of the largest ships in the world with ways a thousand feet long. This plant has cost several millions of dollars, and for all practical purposes is a part of the New York Shipbuilding Co.'s yard. Unless private shipbuilding interests are ready to buy it and pay a fair price for it, the Government ought to keep it and through the New York Shipbuilding Co. construct the ships that it ought to have and for the construction of which there are probably no other existing facilities.

The situation that confronts us is about this: We are comparatively inexperienced in financing, building, and operating ships. We ought to have, for national safety and commercial success, at least 15,000,000 tons of shipping, to be maintained and increased as our trade grows, along with ample shipbuilding and repair yards. We will have this shipping by the close of 1920, with 8,000,000 tons or more of it owned by the Government. What shall we do to bring it ultimately into private hands, insure its maintenance and development to meet the needs of national safety and commerce, and at the same time return to the people the greatest part of their investment?

After consulting with men of experience, who in the suggestions they have made I believe have subordinated their personal interests to the public welfare, I have prepared a bill which I believe can be made to form the basis of such a policy. It coordinates private initiative, incentive, and patriotism with governmental power and responsibility, and, I hope, may accomplish the great purpose sought by all.

Many point out the need of a policy to do what we want done, but few, if any, suggest concrete plans. The Saturday Evening Post of October 18 points out the relative development of ship-

ping since 1914, showing that while the British fleet is smaller by 5,000,000 tons than it would have been if no war had occurred and the German fleet smaller by three and a half millions tons, the American fleet is larger by more than 7,000,000 tons. It goes on to say:

The figures graphically illustrate our enormous relative advance in the shipping field, and ships can now be built in this country cheaper than in England—perhaps cheaper than in Germany.

But neither England nor Germany is overmuch discouraged by that condition. Both of them admit that we have taken a colossal stride in incredibly short time and that at the moment they are handicapped. They say, also, that of old they beat us hollow at shipbuilding and ship operating, and they cherish a notion that under normal conditions they can finally beat us again. They say that building ships in short order under Government fiat is one thing, while operating those ships year in and year out against the competition of the shrewdest, most experienced shipping men and nations of the world is another thing.

And they are largely correct in that contention, and that is one of the conditions that we must take into account in trying to solve this problem.

They rather expect us to make enough mistakes to put the game back into their hands again. They are not without good grounds for their expectation. A full half century of mistaken and ill-considered national policy in respect of American shipping brought it to the pass in which the European war found it in 1914. A new and comprehensive code of shipping laws, buttressed by a sound and far-seeing policy in maritime matters, is the only thing which can prevent our competitors' wishes from coming true.

Everybody agrees that we are to have intensive competition and that we need a sound and far-reaching policy to maintain our proper position, and all the writers on this subject would give more substantial aid by trying to develop such a policy rather than to spend so much time in demonstrating what we all know.

The plan I propose is a concrete one. It has its defects and its dangers. Graft, waste, and extravagance are possible under it; but before it is condemned let some one suggest a plan that will not permit these things. The ships and property we have must be handled and controlled by human agencies with more or less discretion, and as long as this must be so these things can not be wholly avoided. Let those who criticize and condemn this plan suggest something better. Let us construe rather than destroy. Anything better and safer will be welcomed by me. An adequate merchant marine, built in American shipyards by American labor, owned by American capital, operated and manned by American seamen, carrying American commerce to all the ports of the world, and flying the American flag, has been my dream for many years, and it is my purpose to do whatever I can to attain this great end, and I will support any measure and any policy that will give a reasonable assurance of accomplishing this great object.

What I suggest is, in fact, not new. We now have the United States Shipping Board acting in a dual capacity. It was intended to be a great regulatory, governmental agency, and is in fact doing the work of a great corporation. It can not well serve both ends. I do not propose to destroy the Shipping Board. What I propose is to divorce it entirely from building, selling, or operating ships and allow it to do the things it was primarily created to do, and establish a corporation separate and independent of it to operate, maintain, and dispose of our ships in such a way as to give us an adequate merchant marine on a permanent basis. We need an agency that can act promptly and do whatever the emergency or situation demands. The best governmental agencies of this war have been the corporations created to serve particular needs. They have done their work well and with profit to the Government, and have shown that corporate agencies can be used as effectively in governmental activities as in private enterprises.

The first section of this bill declares it to be the policy of the United States to have a merchant marine sufficient to insure our safety in time of emergency, so far as merchant ships can do so, and also sufficient to carry the greater part of our commerce, together with ample shipbuilding and repair plants, all ultimately to be owned and operated by private parties and capital.

Section 2 creates a corporation entirely separate and distinct from the Shipping Board, with nine directors to be appointed by the President from the different sections of the country for a term of eight years. This corporation continues for 30 years unless otherwise provided by law, and has all the powers of a private corporation for the accomplishment of the purposes of its creation. It has no capital stock, but there is transferred to it all the ships of the United States acquired as a result of the war and all the ships, shipyards, property, and assets of the United States Shipping Board and the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation, which shall constitute its capital. It is authorized to use this capital in any way that it deems best to accomplish the purposes of the act. All the contracts and liabilities of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation will be taken

over by it. It is authorized and empowered "to construct, equip, repair, maintain, operate, sell, lease, charter, exchange, or otherwise dispose of vessels of the United States, and issue and deal in maritime securities, make contracts, acquire, hold, and dispose of such other property, both real and personal, as may be necessary and convenient for corporate purposes, and to establish and maintain, within and without the United States, port, terminal, and warehouse facilities and coal or oil bunkers or stations for use in connection with our merchant marine, and to do any and all things deemed by it necessary to develop an adequate American merchant marine composed of ships of suitable types, speed," and so forth. In brief, it is proposed to place in the control of this corporation, whose directors are men of the highest standing and largest business experience, ships, shipyards, and assets which cost about \$3,000,000,000, for the purpose of accomplishing a definite, declared object, and give them full authority to do with these assets a certain and definite thing. Our biggest men will welcome the opportunity to do this great thing. They can do it if it can be done, and I do not doubt that they will do it.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for the transfer to the corporation of the property and assets to be handled by it.

Section 5 extends the coastwise laws to the Sandwich Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Philippines after six months from the passage of the act and directs the corporation to see that adequate service is maintained between the United States and these islands. This will doubtless soon develop a large commerce with these islands and result in private capital taking over any steamship lines the corporation may have to establish and extending them to China and Japan.

Section 6 prohibits competition by the corporation with established American shipping lines.

Section 7 makes the ships of this corporation subject to all the laws of the United States the same as private ships.

Section 8 provides for annual reports.

Section 9 authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Shipping Board to require connection between rail and water carriers, and authorizes these bodies to establish through export rates over rail and water lines to encourage, develop, and increase our commerce.

Section 10 makes it the duty of the Shipping Board to investigate and advise the corporation what steamship lines and postal service should be established and maintained between the ports of the United States and other world ports, together with an estimate of the cost of such postal service, and the type, size, speed, and other requirements of ships, and the corporation is authorized to establish such service as speedily as possible, although the discretion of doing so is left entirely with the corporation.

Section 11 requires the corporation to determine the need for ships between the terminal of the Government railroad in Alaska and other ports, and furnish suitable service for the same unless it can be done by private parties.

Section 12 establishes the principal place of business of the corporation at Philadelphia.

Section 13 repeals the emergency acts under which the present fleet of ships has been constructed, and makes unexpended appropriations available for the work of the corporation.

Section 14 repeals sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Shipping Board act, which authorized the construction, operation, and so forth, of ships.

Section 15 repeals certain acts relating to the coastwise and other emergency legislation.

Section 16 contains the common provision with respect to the effect of declaring unconstitutional any part of the act, and also declares that the specific enumeration of powers shall not exclude other powers embraced within general terms.

Section 17 directs the President to take steps to abrogate the provisions of treaties of commerce that restrict our right to impose discriminating duties on imports.

It may be said that this is a great power and responsibility to put in the hands of a few men. It is; but we have a great property to be handled and a great object to be attained. It must be done in a great way if it is to be done at all.

Mr. President, the committee has not taken up this matter as yet, because we have been waiting for a disposition of the peace treaty. Many of the members of the committee have been working on very important legislation before other committees, including railroad legislation and the peace treaty, so that we have not thought it well to start hearings. I have prepared bills from investigations that I have made as expressive of the views I have reached myself and not as giving the views of the committee in order that concrete propositions may be before the committee as a basis for the hearings which we hope

to begin soon. As I say, the bill to which I have specially referred is prepared without any purpose of doing away with the Shipping Board, and it leaves the Shipping Board to do exactly what it was primarily intended to do.

I have also prepared another bill expressing the views I have on the theory of the Shipping Board handling the ships; and if that should be the policy that should be adopted by the committee after the hearings, then I think these suggestions will be of benefit. These concrete measures will probably aid the committee in getting more prompt action after the committee has had its hearings upon this matter, which I consider really as important a problem as we have before this Congress. I consider it a problem even more difficult of solution than the railroad problem, because we have the experience which no other nation has with reference to the railroad problem, while we are lacking in experience in the shipping problem, and this with the very nature of shipping operations and conditions makes it very difficult to work out.

Mr. President, I present these two bills and I ask that they may be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 3355) to provide for the disposition or operation of merchant vessels of the United States, to stimulate interstate and foreign commerce, to encourage the development of the merchant marine of the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 3356) to create the United States Merchant Marine Corporation and to sustain and build up the merchant marine of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Washington has introduced the bills and explained his purpose; and, to some extent, the plan of the bills. I agree with him that there is no more important subject with which Congress has to deal than this question of taking proper care of the American merchant marine. We are in a position now where we can hold our place, a self-respecting and decent and proper place, on the oceans of the world. I hope the time never will come when the United States will again be a beggar of ships.

Just what may be determined with reference to these bills, I think, will depend somewhat on what is developed before the committee. I take it the chairman will arrange for hearings on the bills, so that we may have the views of all those who are thoroughly acquainted with the problem. It is quite clear in my mind that we ought at least to continue the operation of ships by the Government, either through some corporation or through the Shipping Board, for a period of 5 or 10 years, or until such time as new trade routes are thoroughly established. However, that, no doubt, will be developed upon the hearings on these bills.

Recently I received some very well considered and clear views on this subject from a gentleman who has given it considerable thought, Mr. R. L. McKellar, and I ask that these views may be inserted in the RECORD. I do not know that I care to have them read, unless some other Senator does. These will go along with the observations of the Senator from Washington.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN RAILROAD LINES,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1919.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Operation of the American merchant marine.

DEAR SENATOR: Recalling your talk on the above subject to the Shipping Board men at the Elks Club on Friday afternoon of last week, at which time you invited an expression of individual views.

In response to this invitation, I wish to say that many will agree with you that governmental operation of railroads is undesirable, principally because the roads are owned privately and the Government is under obligations to return them to their owners within a reasonable period after the close of the war.

However, when it comes to the operation of our rapidly increasing merchant marine, it is a different proposition, for the following reasons: First. It is owned by the Government, is essential to world commerce, and is a necessary adjunct to our Navy.

Second. An organization for its operation has been created and is in process of development in accordance with existing needs.

Third. If this organization is continued and stabilized, both in its operation and traffic branches, and expanded to meet the requirements of competition and the increasing outturn of newly constructed vessels, it will mean that our ocean service heretofore so largely concentrated on a few ports will be spread out, and that all of our usable ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific will be supplied with steamship service and new trade routes will be opened up to all ports of the world offering trade with this country.

Fourth. Under Government ownership and operation, these new trade routes can be served and continued until a remunerative business is developed or at least until it is fully demonstrated that the need for such service does not exist.

Fifth. If new construction is stopped and sale of vessels now owned by the Shipping Board is made to private enterprise, it means that under private ownership and operation the larger ports and the best

paying trade routes will, as a matter of course, be given preference and that the establishment of new and remunerative trade routes will be a matter of long-deferred and long-drawn-out development, and in some instances only as the result of an overproduction of shipping and consequent remote necessity for finding additional markets in order to employ such excess shipping.

Sixth. It is even possible that under private ownership and operation that vessels now operated and allotted to new service, as in the case of the newly established service from south Atlantic and Gulf ports, will be withdrawn and put into better paying routes if the present routes are not found immediately remunerative.

Seventh. Competition on the Pacific Ocean is also a matter of vital importance to the permanent establishment of our merchant marine in all directions, and it is extremely doubtful if private enterprise will meet that competition as quickly as will the United States Shipping Board under a well-defined policy of continued and stabilized operation.

Eighth. It is my belief that the United States Government should continue without interruption its shipbuilding program, covering vessels suitable for commercial use, including passenger vessels and colliers for transporting commercial coal, and that Government operation should be continued until our merchant marine is firmly established upon the high seas in the handling of the ocean commerce of the world.

It is my further belief that under stabilized and aggressive governmental operation, coordinated with competitive railroad operation, that our merchant marine will do as much in 5 years toward developing our foreign commerce through all ports as will be done in 25 years if the Shipping Board's building program is arrested and ships now owned are sold to private enterprise and no provision made for absorbing the loss in establishing new trade routes and in regular service from ports heretofore inadequately served.

Canada's merchant-marine policy, as indicated in the following extract from Shipping, is also of interest in its relation to ours:

[Magazine, Shipping, Sept. 27, 1919.]

"The Canadian Government has decided to inaugurate an active shipping policy in conjunction with its railroads. Following the lines developed by the Australian, South African, and other governments, it will operate freight and passenger ships on all the seas in the interest of Canadian commerce.

"The Canadian Government maritime transportation service will be operated by the Canadian national railway board. Next month the board expects to place about 30 vessels in commission, and new vessels will be added as fast as the builders can deliver them. The initial service will start from Halifax and St. John and will include Newfoundland, Liverpool, Glasgow, London, Avonmouth, Kingston, Habana and other West Indian ports, Buenos Aires, and possibly Cape Town.

"An Australian and New Zealand service will be run monthly from Vancouver. The Canadian *Raider*, a 5,100-ton vessel, will shortly be placed on this route. Other vessels for Pacific services to the Orient and India are being built in British Columbia yards and will be commissioned as rapidly as conditions permit. Many of these ships are expected to be on their station before the end of December.

"When the scheme is rounded out the Government of Canada will possess vessels making regular commercial voyages on all the important sea routes of the world. They will be operated solely in the interest of the Canadian people and in cooperation with the Canadian Government railroads, consular and commercial-intelligence service."

Yours, very truly,

R. L. MCKELLAR.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am heartily in sympathy with the bill which the Senator from Washington has just submitted to the Senate. There is, however, another viewpoint of the shipping situation which we must consider in connection with any program, however unimportant. I refer to the boycott of ships which have been completed for the Shipping Board, which belong to the United States, and which may be the precursor of many similar proceedings by some of the affiliated unions of this country. If the resolution which I shall send to the desk in a moment and ask to have read is a fair test of what is coming, we must prepare to overcome them, else we may build our vessels in the hope of restoring the merchant marine of the United States, but the only practical effect will be to make them "painted ships upon a painted ocean."

I ask unanimous consent for the reading of the resolution to which I refer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WATERFRONT WORKERS' FEDERATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST,
San Francisco, Calif., September 4, 1919.

TO SHIPOWNERS, SHIPPERS, CHARTERERS, AND OTHERS CONCERNED:

Herewith find copy of resolution adopted by the Federation on the 3d instant relative to the strike of shipyard workers' unions at Los Angeles against the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.:

"Whereas it is the declared object of the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., backed by the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, to disrupt and destroy the organizations of labor in the shipbuilding industry in Los Angeles; and

"Whereas this attitude on the part of the employing interests is a threat and challenge to organized labor everywhere: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Waterfront Workers' Federation this 3d day of September, 1919, That the members of its affiliated unions will not sail in, handle cargo from or to, or do any overhauling or repairs to steamship *West Calumet* or any other vessel completed by the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. since the strike of the shipyard workers against that establishment until such time as a satisfactory settlement of the dispute is effected; further

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to cooperate with the Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, with a view to making this resolution effective; and further

"Resolved, That the Secretary notify all shipowners, shippers, and charterers, and other employers concerned of this action on the part of the federation."

Respectfully,

DON CAMERON, President.
E. ELLISON, Secretary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has called that resolution to the attention of the Senate. It seems, however, to be a part of a nation-wide program affecting all lines of industry. There is in the bill which I introduced one section to which I did not refer, and that is a provision looking toward the training of American citizens for officers of ships and American seamen to man these ships. If this is carried out and succeeds, as we hope it will, I do not think we will have nearly so much trouble along those lines.

CONTROL OF RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration the conference report on the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, submitted by me on Friday last.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the conference report on, Mr. President?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is on the bill to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission its former jurisdiction with regard to rates and charges for transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. KING. I offer a resolution of ratification and ask that it may be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The resolution of ratification was read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace signed at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and other belligerent powers, with this reservation:

That whereas the Government of the United States takes the view that it is entirely competent through the legislative powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution and the inherent legislative powers of the several States of the Union to deal with all questions of domestic policy, and especially with all questions concerning the status and relations of labor; and

Whereas article 19 of the convention of the league of nations, which is a part of said treaty, provides that the assembly of the league of nations may from time to time advise the consideration by members of the league of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world, under which power the assembly of the league of nations is entirely competent to deal with such conditions of labor as may produce unrest so great as that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled, but notwithstanding said provision said treaty of peace further provides a special international organization of labor which is extraneous to the league of nations, the powers of which are defined in Part XIII of the treaty, comprising articles 387 to 427, inclusive; and

Whereas the Government of the United States does not recognize that the intervention of such said international labor office is at all necessary for the adoption of humane conditions of labor or would promote the cause of labor within the United States, or that such intervention would in any wise be proper or permissible: Therefore

The United States of America withholds its assent to Part XIII, comprising articles 387 to 427, inclusive, of the said treaty of peace, and excepts and reserves the same from the act of ratification; and the United States of America declines to participate in any way in the said general conference or to participate in the election of the governing body of the international labor office constituted by said article, and declines in any way to contribute or be bound to contribute to the expenditures of said general conference or international labor office.

THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record a newspaper article, together with copies of cablegrams from Egypt, protesting against the use of machine guns by the British to suppress peaceful demonstrations for national self-determination. I also ask that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TWO RIOTERS ARE SLAIN IN ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT—TWENTY-SEVEN POLICEMEN AND TEN CIVILIANS INJURED AS RESULT OF NATIONALIST DEMONSTRATION.

ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT, October 25.

Two rioters were killed and 10 others injured and 27 policemen were hurt in a serious nationalist demonstration yesterday. The trouble arose when the police attempted to suppress a peaceable demonstration, such as have recently been a weekly feature of political activity in Alexandria. Sticks, stones, bottles, and police batons first were used. The arrival of the governor of Alexandria restored order for a time. Then two motor lorries with troops appeared on the scene, and eventually shots were fired at the crowd.

To-day there was some recurrence of the trouble at the harbor side, but it was of a comparative minor character.

CAIRO, EGYPT, October 25.

Shouts of "We don't want the Milner Commission!" interrupted a band playing "God save the King" at the public gardens yesterday, giving the signal for a nationalist demonstration. The trouble was quelled by the authorities, who placed a number of students under arrest.

[Cablegrams received from Egypt protesting against use of machine guns by the British to suppress peaceful demonstrations for national self-determination:]

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

Egyptians in expressing their political feelings by peaceful demonstration were met with machine guns. In the name of miserable Egypt we protest against such hellish cruelty in the twentieth century.

STUDENTS NASRICH TRAINING COLLEGE.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

To free Americans protest against shooting by English troops unarmed peaceful demonstrators Alexandria, 24th instant, who asked independence and protested against Milner mission.

ENGINEERING STUDENTS.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

Protest to Americans crimes committed by English against Alexandria manifestants.

AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL MOUSSTOHER.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

To free Americans we protest against British troops shooting unarmed peaceful demonstrators, children, women, men in Alexandria.

EGYPTIAN MEDICAL STUDENTS.

TANTA, October 29, 1919.

On strike and protest ferocity of English troops at Alexandria.

NIZAMIA COLLEGE, TANTA.

TANTA, October 29, 1919.

The Egyptian lives are at stake. We protest against the British force who shot the peaceful manifestants yesterday at Alexandria.

TANTA STUDENTS.

ALEXANDRIA, October 29, 1919.

We protest against English shooting Alexandria natives on 24th and 25th instant.

KAMILIA COLLEGE.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

English military bloodshed recommenced against unarmed peaceful innocent demonstrators in Alexandria; complaints to liberal Americans.

KHEDIVIEH STUDENTS.

ALEXANDRIA, October 29, 1919.

Before American Nation we protest against the atrocities committed by the British soldiers against the unarmed demonstrators in Alexandria.

ALEXANDRIA GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

British troops fixed unarmed peaceful demonstrators in Alexandria 24th. Protest before free Americans.

TEWFIKIEH SCHOOL.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

Students of intermediate school commence strongly protest against abominable atrocities committed in Alexandria yesterday by British troops against unarmed populace.

CAIRO, October 29, 1919.

At the moment when universal peace is reigning everywhere England attempts to strangle peaceable demonstrations by the most brutal force. The principles of the American people are opposed to such inhuman massacre of the weak.

STUDENTS OF ELAZHAR UNIVERSITY.

SHEBINELKOM, October 29, 1919.

We protest energetically against the massacre of peaceable protestants.

STUDENTS OF MASSAI ELMASHKOURA COLLEGE.

DESSOUK, October 31, 1919.

We protest energetically against the British troops who use freely their arms against the inhabitants of Alexandria, and we request American sympathy.

THE INHABITANTS OF DESSOUK, EGYPT.

CAIRO, October 31, 1919.

English forces have begun atrocities and savage rage against unarmed civilians at Alexandria. Women and children were killed. We protest.

WADINIL SCHOOL.

CAIRO, October 31, 1919.

Regret report British troops resumed shooting defenseless women, children, men demonstrating peacefully Alexandria.

COPTIC SCHOOL STUDENTS
(Christian School).

CAIRO, October 31, 1919.

We appreciate efforts American Nation to save us from British imperialism. Confident efforts will continue for humanity's sake until aim attained. Twenty-fourth instant 81 women and children shot or wounded, Alexandria. Please acknowledge.

OFFICIALS OF THE SULTANIC AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

ALEXANDRIA, October 30, 1919.

The Egyptians are being prevented from making peaceful demonstrations by British machine guns. In the name of unhappy Egyptian people we protest against such barbarism committed in the twentieth century.

INHABITANTS OF GABARY, ALEXANDRIA.

DELLA JAMES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that we begin with Calendar No. 201, Senate joint resolution 51, as the preceding bills have been passed over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; we were on Calendar No. 200, House bill 3844, at the time when we last considered the calendar, and had not disposed of that bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is true that that bill was under consideration at the time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we should conclude Calendar No. 200 before we go to No. 201.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will ask that the order be changed so as to begin with Calendar No. 200.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of Della James, the pending question being on the amendment of the Committee on Claims, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "\$60" and insert "\$57.50," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Della James, of Richmond County, Ga., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for herself and in behalf of her children, the sum of \$57.50 per month for a period of 10 years, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss by death of her husband, Alfred J. James, through the explosion of a certain shell used in target practice by the One hundred and seventh Field Artillery, Fifty-third Artillery Brigade, Twenty-eighth Division, at Camp Hancock, near Augusta, Ga., on March 29, 1918, said compensation to be payable from and after March 29, 1918: Provided, That the said money shall be applied to the support of the widow and the said children during their respective minorities, but if she again marries the entire amount thereafter shall be used by her for the benefit of the minor children, and if the mother dies the money shall be paid the oldest child for the minors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add anything to what I said when this bill was up for consideration more than a week ago. I doubt the wisdom of such legislation. I think it would be very much better to follow the practice of the Senate in the past, and pay Della James on the same basis on which other beneficiaries are paid where death has occurred to an employee of the Government. I can not see why the family of a person not in the employ of the Government should receive more compensation on account of an accident than the family of a person employed by the Government. This is a new form of legislation. But if the Senate desires to agree to this bill, adopt this policy, and create a precedent of this character, well and good.

I have no doubt but what sympathy plays a great part in this case, as it does in almost all such cases; but I want the Senate to know what it will lead to in the future. There is not a widow of a soldier of the Civil War, old as they may be, helpless as they are, who is receiving any such amount, with the exception of about 125 widows of officers who served in the Civil War.

I know, Mr. President, it is claimed that the amount that was granted to those widows was granted at a time when the cost of living was a great deal less than it is to-day, and I recognize that fact; but if we are going to take up individual cases and pass bills based upon the sympathy which, of course, every man must have in just such a case, how are we going to escape treating in the same way the hundreds of thousands who are in just as serious a condition, perhaps, as this one widow?

I look at it as being a broader question than this one particular case, and I want to do what I think is my duty by calling attention to what it will lead to in the future if we treat all alike. I would very much prefer, Mr. President, to have the bill amended so as to conform to the practice of the Senate in the past.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What would the widow receive under the regular law or precedent?

Mr. SMOOT. If it were the case of a Government employee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; a Government employee.

Mr. SMOOT. It would be whatever the person killed had been receiving by way of compensation for one year.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, unlike the Senator from Utah, I think I can add a little something to what I said with reference to this same bill when it was up for discussion a week or two ago, and it will be in the way of further answer to the question which has just been put by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

In the first place, I want to have it understood that the man who was killed was not an employee of the Government at all.

He was a farmer, who lived on his little place, which was in the vicinity of the target range run in connection with Fort Hancock, Ga. The target range had been laid out with reference to the presence of the farms of this man and of others like him. A shell fired on the target range killed him on his own place, as he was at work in his own field.

A board of Army officers was convened and made a very thorough investigation of the case and reported that the accident was due entirely to the negligence of the officers who fired the shot, and laid the blame for the death of the man entirely upon those officers. The man left a widow and nine children, the oldest of whom was then 16 years of age, and the ages ranged from that down almost to infants in arms; they were very young children.

The Senator from Utah says that had the man been an employee of the Government his widow would have been entitled to one year's salary. The fact is that had the man been in the employ of the Government, under the Federal compensation act his widow would have received two-thirds of the amount of which her husband was in annual receipt and \$10 a month on account of each child. So had that principle been applied she would have been receiving very much more than is provided in the bill; she would have been in receipt of \$80 a month on account of the children.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is wrong in stating my position. The Senator is discussing the question as though the man were in the Army and lost his life while in the Army, and his widow would receive compensation under the act dealing with soldiers. I had reference to a civilian who is employed by the Government, and this man being a civilian, I compared the two cases and pointed out the distinction.

Mr. NEW. What I stated is what his widow would have received had he been a civilian employee of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken in that.

Mr. NEW. I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure that the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. NEW. I will refer the Senator to the Federal compensation act approved September 7, 1916, chapter 458, volume 39, United States Statutes at Large, sections (a) and (c).

Mr. SMOOT. Does not that act have reference to the war with Germany?

Mr. NEW. Not at all. But, Mr. President, the Senator speaks of what would have been the case had the man been a soldier. Of course, this man was not a soldier. There is no possible theory of law or justice under which he, a man with nine children, could have been taken as a soldier. Of course, he was exempt under the conscription act. He would not have been taken as a soldier except in case of the very direst extremity, when the last man in the country would have been required.

The report that I filed in favor of the allowance of this relief is not based upon any sympathy, or anything of the kind, but, as I think, as a matter of simple justice to the family of a man who was killed on his own place, engaged in work, under the very eyes of his family, and killed through the negligence of the employees of the United States Government. It seems to me that there are no two sides to the question.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] assures me that this woman will have to place a number of her minor children in the poorhouse if this relief is not granted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was mistaken; in the orphans' asylum.

Mr. NEW. But in any event they will become objects of charity, dependent upon the public for support, in case this relief is not granted.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall withdraw all opposition to the bill and let it pass if there is no further opposition to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I shall not oppose the bill, but I am in hearty accord with the view expressed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. We are establishing a precedent that will come home to plague us, and it will be fruitful of bills for appropriation from the Treasury that will greatly increase the already overwhelming burden of public expenditure.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Colorado permit an inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask some one who may know whether it has been the custom of the United States Government to make compensation in such cases?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a long list of appropriations in bills—nearly a dozen—for improper and negligent use of firearms on testing grounds.

Mr. KING. They are lump-sum appropriations, are they not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. All of them are.

Mr. THOMAS. But here is a life annuity.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is only a 10-year annuity.

Mr. THOMAS. It is an annuity for a period of years; and we all know how those things grow in Congress. That is my objection to it. I shall not oppose it further, but I wish to be recorded as voting against it.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not think it a very dangerous precedent for the Government to pay for a tort or negligence of all persons who are in the employ of the Government? I have in my files claims by four individuals who claim to have received injuries at different times, through negligence of employees of the Government, and they want the Government to pay for the injuries which they sustained. In one claim the claimant alleges that a man who was driving a Government van ran into him and seriously injured him. He thinks he ought to have \$10,000 for the injuries sustained, and if the injuries are as serious as he claims them to be I have no doubt in the world in a private suit a jury would give him damages in that amount. The Government has had five or six millions of soldiers and employees under its jurisdiction during the past two years. I have not any doubt in the world there have been hundreds and thousands of accidents as a result of the activities of soldiers and employees of the Government. I have not any doubt in the world that hundreds and thousands of individuals have received serious injuries to their person, and property has been damaged and injured as the result of the carelessness and negligence of individuals employed by the Government, in the line of their employment and within the scope of their employment.

It occurs to me that if the Government were responsible for all their acts of omission, all their negligence, all their defaults in duty, we will have claims against the Government aggregating millions and millions of dollars, and we will be establishing a precedent that will call, for years to come, for millions and tens of millions of dollars.

Does the Senator say there is a precedent and that the Government has in the past laid down the proposition that it will pay for all the defaults and negligence of all persons in its employ?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I have said nothing of the kind, but I do say that in cases of this character there have been a number of bills passed, and that I think it would be utterly indefensible for the Government to decline to pay this claim. Each case stands in a measure upon its own facts. The propriety of the Government paying depends upon the peculiar facts of each case. Here is a case of an Artillery training ground. Here is a farmer quite a distance away, entirely out of the range of legitimate fire, free from all danger if the officers managing the practice grounds did their duty. The farmer is killed by the negligence of those in charge of the training grounds. An investigation is made, and the officers report that the death was due to the indefensible negligence of those in charge, who disregarded distance, disregarded proper direction, and improperly used the target grounds. This man was at work at a place where the Government engineers had, by their decision, advised him that he would be safe. He was working in his field and was killed by the improper and negligent discharge of a gun. Who ought to stand that loss? Ought all the people to stand the loss, or ought the widow and the nine children stand the loss? That is the case that is before us.

The man had nine children, the oldest 16 years and the youngest 4 months old. A tenant farmer at work upon his farm, he had been able to make enough to take care of them. Ought all the public to stand the loss or ought the widow and nine children to stand it?

Mr. KIRBY. May I inquire what committee reported the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It was reported by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Committee on Claims reported it. It has already passed the House. I only want to add that I called on the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress for a report as to whether similar bills had been passed heretofore, and they furnished me a list of about a dozen bills passed for relief in cases of the improper discharge of guns at Artillery training camps, the bills involving various sums. I ask that this list may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The list referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES LAWS RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES RESULTING FROM TARGET PRACTICE.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 586). Secretary of War authorized to adjust and report on claims for damages to private property, not over \$1,000, occasioned by heavy gun fire and target practice.

2. PRIVATE ACTS.

Act of February 16, 1907 (34 Stat., 2413). Payment of \$100 for killing of two horses by Army troops engaged in target practice.

Act of February 16, 1907 (34 Stat., 2413). Payment of \$325 for damages to property incident to Army target practice.

Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., 1868). Payment of \$432.50 for injuries sustained by minor children by accidental explosion of a shell near Artillery target range.

Act of February 20, 1911 (36 Stat., 1995). Payment of \$50 for damages to property during Artillery target practice.

Act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat., 2023). Payment of \$1,080 for benefit of surviving mother of person killed through negligence and carelessness of troops engaged in target practice.

Act of February 7, 1913 (37 Stat., 1361). Payment of \$500 to father of Navy seaman killed in discharge of his duty during target practice.

Act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat., 1304). Payment of \$2,500 to widow of person killed by marines in discharge of their duty in target practice.

Act of July 17, 1914 (38 Stat., 1309). Payment of \$80 for horse killed by shell fire by Artillery while at target practice.

Act of September 15, 1914 (38 Stat., 1456). Payment of \$1,500 for loss of one eye, etc., caused by wound received at hands of party of sailors and marines engaged at target practice.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator is perfectly right in saying the Senate has heretofore made appropriations for such cases, but it never made an appropriation in this way, as I stated. It has appropriated a lump sum, the same as it has done in the past for other causes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But that money was appropriated only to pay the damage for the killing of a horse, or something of that kind. Congress has appropriated money to meet the damage in each instance, but this appropriation does not nearly meet the damage to this widow.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] might go a good deal further and call attention to hundreds of millions of dollars which the Government of the United States has paid out when there has been damage done to property of the people in the United States. I am a member of the Committee on Claims, and I have very often become impatient with the idea that when human lives are taken they shall not be considered. I believe we ought to pay this woman, I care not whether she is a poor woman or a rich woman. This man's life was destroyed, and Government officials were responsible for it. I am sure that if we had destroyed a ship or destroyed property belonging to some citizen of the United States we would not have hesitated for a moment, but would have allowed a legitimate claim for the destruction of the property. I am sick and tired, Mr. President, of the idea that when citizens are injured or human lives are being destroyed the claims shall not be paid. As one member of the Committee on Claims I shall certainly support the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can not permit the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to end this discussion without assuring the Senate that my objection to the bill has nothing to do with the circumstances or character of the claim. It is a matter to me of governmental power and of precedent.

The Senator says that if property were destroyed there would be no question about the promptness of enactment of a bill reimbursing the owner. That is only partially true, if we are to consider the vast number of bills which are introduced and which go to the Committee on Claims for property lost. I am quite frequently in receipt of petitions and appeals, both in person and by mail, to urge upon the Committee on Claims of the Senate the immediate consideration of claims for damage or destruction of property. I am very sure, when we consider the number of claims which are so allowed and contrast them with the number of claims which are disallowed and the number upon which final action is not taken, the Senator will modify his statement.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I have been on the Committee on Claims for a number of years. I know of no claim that has been disallowed where it has been proved beyond a question of doubt that the officials of the Government were at fault.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, I accept the Senator's statement. He knows more about it than I do. I base my opinion upon my experience, which is not identified with the action of the Committee on Claims at all; but I know a great many of the bills which are reported from the Committee on Claims are bitterly contested and a great many of them defeated on the floor of the Senate. So it is, I think, going a little too far to assert that we are discriminating between claims for damages growing out of the destruction of property and those which are intended as compensation for human life. The latter class of claims appeal to me, and I think to every man who is normal, much more keenly than mere compensation for the destruction of property.

The fundamental trouble is that the people are becoming more and more prone to come to Washington and ask for compensation, for reimbursement, for appropriations for everything which occurs in the various complications of human life, both in the social and in the industrial world, and we are quite as prone to receive them, and a good deal more prone to act upon them when they involve the human equation than otherwise.

The taxpayers must be considered sooner or later, because when the burden gets beyond their power to bear it they are going to collapse and the Government will collapse. We may keep on without regard to their condition, and to our duty, until the expenses of the Government so overlap its revenues as to make its financial future not only a contingency but a certainty of an ultimate necessary and radical transformation of our ways of doing business.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to say only one word, Mr. President. Of course, there is no other place to come but to Washington to adjust a claim like this. If the Government is responsible because of a certain department of the Government under which this whole trouble arose and the injury was inflicted, it has not the power to adjust it without some legislative authority. The War Department could not pay any claim, no matter how just and how proper and how right it might be. The claimant must come to Congress for relief in this instance. It seems to me it is an entirely legitimate and proper claim and ought to be paid.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me, I might suggest the fact that the local board of officers investigating this matter recommended that the Secretary of War bring it to the attention of Congress, that compensation for the damage might be made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. Are we proceeding under Rule VIII with the consideration of unobjected bills, with one speech of five minutes by each Senator desiring to speak, or is the bill just generally before the Senate? There have been three or four speeches made by some Senators.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what amount of money is carried by the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Fifty-seven dollars and fifty cents a month.

Mr. SMOOT. It amounts to \$6,000 in 10 years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Fifty-seven and one-half dollars a month to pay a widow on her own behalf and on behalf of her nine minor children, because her husband, a hard-working man, who had been supporting his family, was killed through the negligence of officials of the Government while acting in a governmental capacity! I merely wanted to suggest to the Senator from Georgia, since I have noticed the difficulty he has had in promoting the passage of what seems to me to be a very meritorious measure, that it might facilitate its passage if he would increase the amount from \$57.50 a month to something like a million dollars or perhaps a hundred million dollars and make the beneficiaries the people of Upper Silesia instead of a widow and her nine children, citizens of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RIOT OF NEGRO SOLDIERS AT HOUSTON, TEX.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) directing the Court of Claims to investigate claims for damages growing out of the riot of United States negro soldiers at Houston, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the joint resolution goes over.

ELIZABETH WHITE.

The bill (S. 2672) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Utah to withdraw his objection. The bill, I will state, is in favor of an old lady in the State of Louisiana, who is past 80 years of age. The bill has passed the House of Representatives twice; it has passed the Senate twice; and it was omitted by a clerical error from the omnibus claims bill which passed the Senate finally in March, 1915. It is to provide for the payment of a claim which was found to be just and proper by the Court of Claims. I therefore hope the Senator from Utah will not insist upon his objection. Unless the appropriation carried in the bill is speedily granted, it will not do this old lady any good at all. The claim has gone through the Court of Claims; it has gone

through both Houses of Congress. It is due simply to a clerical error that she did not get the money four years ago.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Louisiana is slightly in error, I think, when he says that the necessity for this legislation is due to a clerical error. This claim was carried in the omnibus claims bill at the close of the Sixty-fourth or Sixty-third Congress; I forget which.

Mr. RANDELL. It was the Sixty-third Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. It was the last omnibus claims bill considered by Congress, no matter what the session was, and, like many other claims, was stricken from the omnibus bill because it did not fall within the character and class of claims which it had been agreed by both Houses of Congress should be paid. That, I will say to the Senator, is the fact of the matter; and that is why I ask that the bill now go over; for if this claim is paid, Mr. President, every claim that was then stricken from that omnibus claims bill should be paid.

Mr. RANDELL. This claim was not stricken from the omnibus claims bill to which the Senator refers. There was a motion made to strike it from the bill, but the motion was overruled, and the claim was incorporated in the bill as passed by the House. When it came to the Senate the committee reported an amendment striking the claim from the bill, but that was overruled, and it remained in the omnibus claims bill; and, I repeat, but for a clerical error made during the last hours of the session the amount would have been paid to this old lady years ago. However, the bill did pass the Senate in the Sixtieth and the Sixty-first Congresses, and it passed the other House in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses. We have acted on the bill twice, and when it was included in the omnibus claims bill that was the third time it came before the Senate. It certainly is a meritorious claim.

This old lady, as I have said, is 80 years of age; she is in very distressing circumstances; she needs the money badly; and, Senators, it would be cruel not to give it to her at this time. I therefore appeal to the Senator from Utah not to insist upon his objection, and to let the bill go through.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this claim was rejected by the Senate on March 3, 1915. At that time a proposed amendment striking this claim from the bill was made the subject of debate; and by a vote of the Senate was rejected.

I know it is hard, Mr. President, to stand here and resist the appeal of a Senator who says that this is the claim of a woman 80 years of age; but this is one of the old claims that fell outside of the rule of the Committee on Claims in considering such matters.

In further answer to the Senator in relation to these claims, I desire to say that this bill only emphasizes a practice that has been followed in the Senate and in the other House for years; and a very bad practice, too. The House pays very little attention to claims when they come up there in the form of House bills, because it is said the Senate will give careful consideration to them. The Senate also has passed bills time and time again thinking that they will not be considered favorably by the House. That is a practice that ought to cease.

Mr. RANDELL. Let me ask the Senator from Utah if the Court of Claims did not have this claim before it, and if they did not find that this amount was due?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not had time to closely examine the matter.

Mr. RANDELL. That is what the report says—that the claim was before the Court of Claims and they found a certain amount was due for sugar and molasses taken, and that a certain amount was due for the use of a steamboat that belonged to the estate of the deceased.

Mr. SMOOT. If we had time to call a quorum of the Senate to discuss this question, decide as to its merits, and then take a vote upon it, I would not now ask that it go over; but we have not time now to fully consider the matter.

Mr. RANDELL. If we take that course it means the denial of justice to this lady. The bill, I repeat, was acted on four years ago; it was in the omnibus claims bill, and was stricken out because of a clerical error. Under those circumstances, it seems to me very hard for the Senator from Utah to insist upon his objection in view of the fact that the bill has twice passed the Senate, twice passed the other House, and had been included in the omnibus claims bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to ask that the bill go over for the present, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN H. RHEINLANDER.

The bill (S. 1302) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE TEXAS CO.

The bill (S. 1255) authorizing the Texas Co. to bring suit against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no report from any of the departments upon this measure, and I ask that it go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I should like to know to what department the Senator from Utah is referring. I wish to know for my own guidance.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill relates to damages caused by a collision, and I do not know whether the collision was with a steamer under the control of the Treasury Department—that is, a steamer of the Public Health Service—or whether the vessel was under the control of the War Department; but whatever department had control of the vessel which was involved in the collision, I think the committee ought to secure a report from that department, secure full details, and ascertain what, if any, action has been taken by the department.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; I will endeavor to have that course pursued.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that the committee looked upon the bill merely as conferring authority to present to the Court of Claims the question of damages resulting to the steamer *Texas* from the collision between that steamer and a United States steamship. Every detail of the claim will be considered by the Court of Claims? The bill appropriates no money, but merely, I repeat, confers authority on the Court of Claims to hear the case.

Mr. SMOOT. Similar claims to the one involved in this measure have been settled, as they will be settled in the future, after a survey made by the officials of the department controlling the steamer. I can not see why this claim should be treated in any other way than that, and before I would feel justified in letting the claim go to the Court of Claims I should want to know whether the department has taken any action in respect to it, whether a survey was made, and what the findings were.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 413) for the relief of the Canadian Car & Foundry Co. (Ltd.) was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS MACHINE TOOLS.

The bill (S. 3125) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus machine tools and other equipment to the Federal Board for Vocational Education was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Department," to insert "on the filing with the War Department of an itemized receipt for the articles thus transferred. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall annually report to Congress the disposition and use of the articles, the transfer of which is herein authorized," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War shall have authority to transfer to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, without compensation therefor, certain surplus machine tools and other equipment of the approximate value of \$250,000 belonging to the War Department and now in possession of the Federal board and being used by that board as equipment in schools for vocational education controlled by the board. Property so transferred shall be dropped from the records of the War Department on the filing with the War Department of an itemized receipt for the articles thus transferred. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall annually report to Congress the disposition and use of the articles, the transfer of which is herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I think this bill or a bill similar to it was passed a few days ago.

Mr. SMOOT. There was objection made to the bill at that time, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I thought the objection was withdrawn.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSTRUCTION OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 3126) authorizing the detail of commissioned officers of the Army to take courses of instruction within two years from date of commission was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no provision of existing law with reference to the detail or assignment of officers of the Regular Army shall hereafter operate to prevent within a period of two years from date of first

commission the detail or assignment of any commissioned officer of the Regular Army to take a basic course of instruction at a service school in the duties of his arm or branch of the service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOAD LINES FOR VESSELS.

The bill (S. 575) to establish load lines for certain vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask that for the bill the title of which has just been read there be substituted Calendar No. 239, being the bill (H. R. 3621) to establish load lines for certain vessels. The House bill is practically the same as the Senate bill, with one or two minor changes, perhaps bettering the bill somewhat. I was authorized by the Commerce Committee to report the House bill and ask that it be substituted on the calendar for the Senate bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill on the calendar and the Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida insist upon taking up the measure now? It is a rather long bill, consisting of eight or nine pages.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is quite a long bill, but I will say to the Senator that the bill has been referred to the Shipping Board and the Department of Commerce and both have approved it. It was really prepared as a result of the joint work of the Shipping Board and the Department of Commerce, through their officers, and they regard it as very important.

I know there is some objection to the idea of establishing a load line at all; but we are about the only country in the world that has not some provision of that kind in its maritime laws. The department feels it is quite important; we have no legislation of that character now, and it is believed that it is very desirable that we make provision for establishing a load line below which vessels can not be loaded on salt water.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator, too, that as I understand this will enable our officials to meet discriminations on the part of other countries that work against our shipping by reason of their load-line laws? At present, as we have no such law, we can not do it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is one reason why they think it is important to establish by law a load line. The method of doing it has met the approval of the departments, and it is considered a very important thing. If we are going to do it at all, we ought to do it now, in order that the necessary machinery may be established for taking care of that situation. They consider it quite important.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if hearings have been held upon this bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not recall that we had any formal hearings on it. The committee considered it during the last Congress and reported out a bill, and, of course, we conferred with the officers in the different departments, the Shipping Board people, and the Department of Commerce people. I do not know that we had any formal hearings on it. I do not think we did.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that we had no formal hearings, and no objections have come to the committee against it from any of the shipping interests. It was pending before the committee for quite a good while, and, as the Senator says, was reported at the last Congress.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have received only one letter on the subject, and that is from Mr. Pendleton, of Pendleton Bros. (Inc.), shipbuilders and brokers, of New York. They oppose the passage of any law regulating the load-line proposition.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that I have not studied the bill carefully, but I observe that there are a number of penalties in it, and apparently it is a very important bill, and I do not think we ought to pass it in a hurry. I think I shall ask that it go over for to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Order of Business 239 is substituted for Order of Business 208, and it will be passed over.

Mr. FLETCHER subsequently said:

Mr. President the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] made inquiry with regard to hearings on this load-line bill. I stated that the only opposition to it that had come to my notice was a letter from Mr. Fields S. Pendleton, of Pendleton Bros., and I think, in fairness to both sides and to all concerned, that that letter might go into the RECORD, so that when this matter is taken up again for consideration it can be referred to. I ask to have the letter included in the RECORD in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, October 18, 1919.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Apropos of our conversation of Thursday, I write to ask if you would have the load-line bill (S. 575) recalled to the Commerce Committee, so that the owners might be heard, because, in my judgment, it is a matter that means a great deal to American shipping and is too important a matter to be enacted into law until American shipowners have an opportunity to present their side of the case.

To my knowledge, this matter has been before Congress a number of times. I am quite sure Gen. Grosvenor was chairman of the House committee when it came up, and after a hearing and protest by the owners it was turned down. We took it up with Senator Frye and Senator Mallory, and they were both against the bill, so we did not have much worry in the Senate, as they were the leaders on both sides in the Commerce Committee on shipping matters.

We believe that the loading of a ship should be left to the master. He knows his ship, he knows the kind of cargo he is carrying, and he knows the voyage he must make, and whether the weather will be fair or stormy in the latitudes that he goes into.

A proper load line from Pensacola to Habana, in January, is not a proper load line for the same month from Pensacola to Boston, for on the latter voyage a vessel would ice up, and sometimes get from 300 to 500 tons of ice on her hull and rigging. Furthermore, a load line from Hampton Roads to Boston in the summer time is not a proper load line from Hampton Roads to Boston in the wintertime. The master of the ship decides all of these things, knowing how his ship performs in gales and storms; he is risking his own life and has more at stake than anybody else. He is supreme in command, and it is not right to dictate to him any more than it is how he should handle his ship in a storm.

You could not load a ship any deeper with a load line on a short passage, when the weather is calm, than you could on a long passage, where you will have storms. One great advantage in not having a load line is that the master, by being able to use his own judgment, can carry more cargo at times than others, and in that way even up, so that in the end he can carry more tons of cargo and safer than if he was loading to the same draft at all times. This is the method of all prudent and skilled shipmasters. I can show you that vessels range from 10 per cent to 20 per cent difference in the loading of deadweight cargoes on different voyages and at different seasons of the year; and it will be time enough for the gentlemen who urge this legislation to show a single vessel that was lost by reason of being overloaded.

Senator, we have too much governmental regulation on shipping now, too many delays for inspections, time lost in making applications, in getting inspectors to come on board of ships, in making their reports and filing them in the customhouse, and going through the routine of work in order to get the ship's papers, so that she may clear. All of these delays are costly.

The cargo-carrying trade of the future will be fuel, and Hampton Roads is going to control the world. A load line that permits a ship to load down only to a certain point at Hampton Roads in the summer time for a voyage around Cape Horn or Cape Good Hope will make her lose from 600 to 800 tons of cargo, for that is where the ship will get her stormy weather in their winter season. She will be lightened some 600 to 800 tons before getting to those points, and consequently would lose the freight on this amount of cargo, meaning from \$20,000 to \$30,000 on each voyage.

It is important that our ships be able, owing to the high cost of fuel, to take all of the bunker coal possible when leaving our ports. We are continually lightening the ship every day from 25 to 50 tons. We need this to overcome the excessive bunkering charges in foreign countries.

A few years ago a merchant in Europe or Africa could buy a 5,000-ton cargo of coal at Hampton Roads for \$9,000, or as low as \$1.80 per ton. To-day, for that same cargo, he must pay \$175,000, or \$35 per ton, cost and freight, before the ship sails. On his first cargo he would carry the coal in his own ship and the freight would be paid in Europe, while now American vessels have just begun to take away this trade.

The coal trade is the main thing that has built up England's shipping business. She exported before the war \$7,000,000 tons of coal and last year 27,000,000 tons. Bunker coal to-day in England is more than \$25 per ton, while ours at Hampton Roads is \$7.50. We shall need within the next 18 months all of the advantages that we can get. The shipping situation is no longer a fight of individuals and corporations; it has narrowed down to a fight of nations—Great Britain against the United States, with Japan crawling slowly for the control of the Pacific. England has never failed to protect her shipping at any cost, and since she started subsidies, in 1839, figuring interest at 6 per cent, she has paid, up to the beginning of the war, her shipowners \$3,500,000,000, which was more than her shipping was worth at that time.

It is a fight for freight to a finish. I predict that within 18 months we shall see the lowest freight rate, taking into consideration the cost of operation, that we have ever seen. There will be more ships than there are cargoes, and whoever can do the business the cheapest will continue. The Englishman has always had the business and will fight hard to hold it. We can not expect to drive them out of business on the same basis of profit that we can attract new American capital into it. With more ships than cargoes, the freight rate will drop to a point that makes it unprofitable for one or the other to continue shipbuilding. The question is: Will Great Britain be able to build and operate cheaper than the United States? If we have some little advantage now in the load line, we can not afford to give it up.

Very respectfully,

FIELDS S. PENDLETON.

WATER SUPPLY, SUNNYSIDE, UTAH.

The bill (S. 46) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah, was considered in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the public lands within the several townships and subdivisions thereof hereinafter enumerated, situated in the county of Carbon and State of Utah, are hereby reserved from all forms of location, entry, or appropriation, whether under the mineral or nonmineral land laws of the United States, and set aside as a municipal water-supply reserve for the use and benefit of the people of the town of Sunnyside, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, as follows, to wit: The south half of south half of section 34, in township 13 south, range 14 east, Salt Lake base and meridian; and also the following lands which, when surveyed, will be described as follows, to wit: All of section 11; west half of section 12; all of section 13; and all of section 14, in township 14 south, range 14 east, of Salt Lake base and meridian.

SEC. 2. That the lands heretofore described and reserved for municipal water-supply purposes shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with and at the exclusive expense of the town of Sunnyside, Utah, for the purpose of storing, conserving, and protecting from pollution the said water supply, and preserving, improving, and increasing the timber growth on said lands, to more fully accomplish such purposes; and to that end said municipality shall have the right, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to the use of any and all parts of the lands reserved for the storage and conveying of water and construction and maintenance thereon of all improvements for such purposes.

SEC. 3. That the said Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe and enforce such regulations as he may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this act, including the right to forbid persons other than those authorized by him and the municipal authorities of said municipal corporation from entering or otherwise trespassing upon these lands, and any violation of this act or of regulations issued thereunder shall be punishable as is provided for in section 50 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, approved March 4, 1909" (35 Stat. L., p. 1098), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 857).

SEC. 4. That this act shall be subject to all legal rights heretofore acquired under any law of the United States, and the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2189) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The bill (S. 2789) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to any lands within the Sierra National Forest, Calif., if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture the public interests will be benefited thereby and the lands are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, and in exchange therefor may give not to exceed an equal value of such national forest land or timber or assignable certificates for timber within the national forests in California as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and in determining the relative values of the lands or timber to be exchanged, consideration shall be given to any reservations which either party may make of timber, minerals, or easements. Such assignable certificates for timber shall be issued under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be for the agreed value of lands acquired, and shall be acceptable only at their face value when accompanying bids for the purchase of national forest timber or in payment for national forest timber in California when purchased under existing laws and regulations. Timber given in such exchanges shall be cut and removed under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests, and under the direction and supervision and in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become a part of the Sierra National Forest.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION ON RURAL AND URBAN HOME SETTLEMENT.

The bill (S. 2444) to create the commission on rural and urban home settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BAR OF DISLOYALISTS.

The bill (S. 2323) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Utah is informed in regard to the provisions of this bill. I should like to state the substance of it, and then, if the Senator has any objection, all right.

Mr. KING. I will withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Section 3480 of the Revised Statutes prohibits any person who participated in the so-called Rebellion from prosecuting any claim against the United States. Since that time the soldiers and the postmasters have been allowed to collect their claims when found upon the books of the Treasury Department to be due these parties for services performed prior to the war. The only persons who have not been allowed to collect their claims are the sailors and the marines, and this bill repeals that section in their interest. That is all it is. It simply allows the marines and sailors to collect the claims due them on the books of the Treasury. It amounts to only about twenty to fifty thousand dollars. Having paid the postmasters and having paid the soldiers, I do not see and the committee did not see why we should not pay the sailors and marines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 4, after the words "United States," to insert "approved July 6, 1914," and in line 6, after the word "Revenue," to insert a hyphen and the word "Cutter," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," approved July 6, 1914, be amended by adding after the word "Army" the words "Navy, Marine Corps, and Revenue-Cutter Service."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA.

The bill (S. 2798) authorizing the removal of stumps from cut-over Oregon and California lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this involves any expense to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. None whatever.

Mr. NORRIS. In that connection, I notice that upon the face of the bill it does not appear what the object is. There is no money paid for the removal of these stumps. What reason is there for the enactment of the measure, and what is expected to be accomplished by it?

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps I had better read the report from the Acting Secretary of the Interior. That explains it in as few words as possible. This is a letter addressed by the Acting Secretary of the Interior to Mr. FERRIS, the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House. He says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 14, 1917.

Hon. SCOTT FERRIS.

Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: I am in receipt of your favor of the 4th instant, transmitting a copy of H. R. 5645—

That is the same as this bill—

with the request that a report be furnished to the committee thereon, together with such suggestions and recommendations as I may desire to make.

This bill, entitled "A bill authorizing removal of stumps from cut-over Oregon and California lands," had its origin in a request addressed to the department through members of the Oregon delegation, asking for the privilege of removing stumps suitable for making ship knees from the cut-over Oregon and California grant lands, which were revested in the United States by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., 218).

Under the act of reversion, no authority exists for the disposition of either the land or the timber thereon until due classification and an order for the restoration thereof. The request, accordingly, could not be granted under the existing law.

There is an urgent emergency, however, for ship-knee timber, such as may be secured from stumps standing on the Oregon and California cut-over lands. The removal of the stumps will add to the value of the land when it is ready for disposition. The bill enables this department to protect all possible interests of the United States or others which may be affected by it, and I would, accordingly, recommend its passage.

Cordially, yours,

ALEXANDER T. VOGELSONG,
Acting Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make any and all regulations found necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall be, and is hereby, authorized to grant within his discretion free permits for the removal of stumps from cut-over timberlands embraced within the former grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and revested in the United States by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., p. 218), subject to such terms and conditions as he may impose for the protection of all rights and interests of the United States and such others, if any, that may be affected thereby.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make any and all regulations found necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATTHEW McDONALD.

The bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Matthew McDonald was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw that objection for a minute. Mr. McDonald was only 11 years of age when he enlisted in the Navy. He served two months, and was taken out by his mother on a letter from the governor of the State. On the records of the Navy he is carried as a deserter. Of course, he had no right to enlist without the consent of his parents before he was 18. At his own request an amendment is recommended to the bill that no pension shall ever be paid on account of his service; so it is proposed simply to correct his record.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator whether automatically, under existing law, he would not receive a pension?

Mr. CURTIS. No; the bill especially provides that he shall not, and the amendment was recommended at his request. Under the ordinary wording of bills he would draw a pension; but at his suggestion an amendment was prepared providing that no pension, back pay, or bounty shall ever be paid on account of that service.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to my colleague that a provision of that kind is so uncommon in bills of this nature that I was surprised when I read it.

Mr. KING. I withdraw the objection. I supposed that the plan was the one usually pursued, namely, to receive a pensionable status, and then the first thing the deserter does is to get a pension.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "shall," to strike out "accrue prior to the passage of this act" and insert "be allowed, and no back pay and bounty shall be paid because of the enactment of this legislation," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws Matthew McDonald shall be hereafter held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States Navy October 20, 1863: *Provided,* That no pension shall be allowed and no back pay and bounty shall be paid because of the enactment of this legislation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3201) fixing the salary of the district attorney for the eastern district of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LANDS IN IDAHO.

The bill (S. 1300) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Minidoka, Idaho, for railroad purposes was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "by," to strike out "appraisal" and insert "the Secretary of the Interior, in order to return the expenditure heretofore made or proposed for the irrigation of the lands," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell and convey to Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah and authorized to do business in the State of Idaho, its successors and assigns, for railroad purposes, and at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior in order to return the expenditure heretofore made or proposed for the irrigation of the lands at not less than \$50 per acre, and under such terms, conditions, and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the following described land, situated in Minidoka County, Idaho:

All that part of the west half of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 2, and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 11, all in township 8 south, range 25 east of the Boise meridian, within the following described area:

Beginning at the intersection of the present southeasterly right of way boundary of the Twin Falls Branch of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. with the section line common to said sections 2 and 11, 100 feet southeasterly from and at right angles to the center line of main track of said railroad, said intersection also bearing north 89° 5' west, 460.1 feet from the quarter section corner common to said sections 2 and 11; thence north 40° 25' east along said southeasterly right of way boundary, being 100 feet southeasterly from and parallel to said center line of main track, for a distance of 1,726.8 feet; thence south 0° 1' east, and parallel to the north and south center line of said section 2, for a distance of 1,332.6 feet, to a point in the section line common to said sections 2 and 11; thence continuing south 0° 1' east, and parallel to the north and south center line of said section 11, for a distance of 1,320 feet, to the south line of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of

said section 11; thence north 89° 5' west, along said south line, for a distance of 2,229.5 feet, to a point in the present southeasterly right of way boundary of said railroad; thence north 40° 25' east, along said right of way boundary, and being 100 feet southeasterly from and parallel to said center line of main track, for a distance of 1,710.4 feet, to the point of beginning, and containing in all 67.87 acres, more or less, within the proposed pumping unit of the Minidoka project of the United States Reclamation Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS.

The bill (S. 2188) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133), was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. L., p. 1133), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That section 4 of the act of August 18, 1894, entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes,' be, and the same is hereby, amended so that the 10-year period within which any State shall cause the lands applied for under said act to be irrigated and reclaimed, as provided in said section, as amended by the act of June 11, 1896, shall begin to run from the date of approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the State's application for the segregation of such lands; and if actual construction of reclamation works is not begun within three years after the segregation of the lands or within such further period as shall be allowed by the Secretary of the Interior, the said Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may restore such lands to the public domain; and if the State fails, within 10 years from the date of such segregation, to cause the whole or any part of the lands so segregated to be so irrigated and reclaimed, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, continue said segregation for a period not exceeding five years, or may, in his discretion, restore such lands to the public domain upon the expiration of the 10-year period or of any extension thereof."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 2379) to provide for the disposition of certain public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497), and which are no longer needed, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior any lands which have been withdrawn under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497), for the purpose of exploratory drilling to discover water supplies for irrigation or other purposes, and which have had wells or other permanent improvements placed thereon by and at the expense of the United States, are no longer needed for the purpose for which they were withdrawn and improved, the Secretary of the Interior may appraise the lands, together with the improvements thereon, and thereafter sell the same for not less than the appraised value at public auction to the highest bidder, after giving public notice of the time and place of sale by posting upon the land and publication for not less than 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of the land.

SEC. 2. That upon payment of the purchase price the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by appropriate patent to convey all the right, title, and interest in and to said lands to the purchaser at said sale, subject, however, to such reservations, limitations, or conditions as said Secretary may deem proper: *Provided*, That not over 160 acres shall be sold to any one person.

SEC. 3. That the moneys derived from the sale of such lands and improvements be disposed of as are other receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF SCHOOL-TEACHERS.

The bill (H. R. 5818) for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in favor of this bill with some modifications, but it will need considerable attention, and as there are only a few moments of the morning hour remaining I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL.

The bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY.

The bill (S. 3239) to amend the Army appropriation act for 1920, so as to authorize travel allowances to persons discharged from disciplinary barracks and other places of confinement other than honorably, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, under the heading "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the following words: "for travel allowance to persons on their discharge from the United States disciplinary barracks or from any place in which they have been held under a sentence of dishonorable discharge and confinement for more than six months, or from the Government Hospital for the Insane, after transfer thereto from such barracks or place to their homes (or elsewhere as they may elect), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the place of last enlistment"; and substituting therefor the following words: "for travel allowance to all persons discharged from the service of the United States otherwise than honorably, from the place of discharge or release, if thereafter detained at the Government Hospital for the Insane or otherwise held in restraint under proper authority, to their bona fide homes (or elsewhere as they may elect with the approval of the discharging officer), provided the cost in each case shall not be greater than to the man's bona fide home."

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, to strike out the words "if thereafter," and in line 10 to insert the word "whether," so that the clause would read:

For travel allowance to all persons discharged from the service of the United States otherwise than honorably, from the place of discharge or release, whether detained at the Government Hospital for the Insane, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS BY INDIANS IN WASHINGTON.

The bill (S. 157) authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature, both legal and equitable, of the tribes and bands of Indians, or any of them, with whom any of the treaties of Medicine Creek, dated December 26, 1854; Point Elliott, dated January 22, 1855; Point-no-Point, dated January 26, 1855; the Quin-al-ets, dated May 8, 1859, growing out of said treaties, or any of them, including claims for allotments of land, or the value thereof, which they failed to receive under any of said treaties; and that all claims of whatever nature, both legal and equitable, which the Muckleshoot, San Juan Island Indians; Nook-Sack, Chinook, Upper Chehalis, Lower Chehalis, and Humpthulp Tribes or Bands of Indians, or any of them (with whom no treaty has been made), may have against the United States shall be submitted to the Court of Claims, with right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States for determination and jurisdiction, both legal and equitable, is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any and all suits brought hereunder and to render final judgment therein: *Provided*, That the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States shall not extend to those tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, with whom no treaty has been made: *Provided further*, That the court shall also consider and determine any legal or equitable defenses, set-offs, or counter claims which the United States may have against any of said tribes, bands, or individual Indians.

SEC. 2. That the Court of Claims shall advance the cause or causes upon its docket for hearing, and shall have authority to determine and adjudge all rights and claims, both legal and equitable, of said Indians, tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, and of the United States in the premises, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation.

SEC. 3. That suit or suits instituted hereunder shall be begun by such Indians, tribe, tribes, or bands of Indians, as parties plaintiff, and the United States as the party defendant. The petition or petitions may be verified by attorney or attorneys employed by such tribes or Indians upon information and belief as to the facts therein alleged, and no other verification shall be necessary: *Provided*, That the attorney or attorneys of said tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, shall be selected by the claimant Indian or Indians with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and upon final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine a reasonable fee, not to exceed 10 per cent of the recovery, to be paid to the attorneys employed by the said tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, and the same shall be included in the decree and shall be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due said tribes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no report here from the Interior Department or from any other department of the Government.

Mr. JONES of Washington rose.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Washington kindly explain this bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that at the last Congress the Committee on Indian Affairs had quite extensive hearings on a similar bill. Representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs were present, as well as representatives of the Indians. The bill was referred to a subcommittee and hearings were had. The subcommittee reported to the full committee, which took the matter up very carefully and reported the

bill in exactly this form, and it passed the Senate at the last Congress. The amendment offered to the bill here was suggested by the department. I trust there will be no objection to it.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, to insert the words "within five years from the date of the passage of this act," so as to read:

That suits or suits instituted hereunder shall be begun within five years from the date of the passage of this act by such Indians, tribe, tribes, or bands of Indians as parties plaintiff and the United States as the party defendant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN INDIAN ALLOTMENT.

The bill (S. 3115) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct an error in an Indian allotment was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of correcting an error made in the allotment on the public domain of Domatil E. Lafournaise, an Indian of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa, whereby the same is in conflict with the allotment of Jenoir Brien, a member of the same band, and to clear title to the land allotted to Jenoir Brien, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a patent in fee to lot 5 of the southeast quarter of section 6, township 159 north, range 103 west of the principal meridian in North Dakota, in favor of Henry F. Thomas, holder of a deed to the allotment of Domatil E. Lafournaise (now Patnaude); said patent to issue upon the execution by Henry F. Thomas of a quitclaim deed in favor of E. L. Hugelen, purchaser of the allotment of Jenoir Brien and erroneously included in the allotment of Domatil E. Lafournaise.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) providing that whenever the United States becomes a member of the league of nations this Government should present to the council or the assembly of the league the state of affairs in Ireland and the right of its people to self-government was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

NONMAILABLE MATTER.

The bill (S. 729) to amend section 217 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 217 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, be amended by striking therefrom the words "kill, or" in the last sentence thereof and by adding thereto the following:

"Whoever shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery, or shall knowingly cause to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at any place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable, with the design, intent, or purpose to kill the person to whom such article or thing is addressed, or any other person, shall suffer death.

"Any person violating any provisions of this act may be tried and punished either in the district in which the unlawful article or thing was mailed, or to which it was carried by mail for delivery according to the direction thereon, or in which it was caused to be delivered by mail to the person to whom it was addressed."

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, to strike out the words "suffer death," and to insert the words "upon conviction, be punished by death or imprisonment for not less than 20 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF JUDICIAL CODE.

The bill (S. 2692) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, some Senators have asked me what the bill means. It is the language of the law as it is now, but under the present law if a man has a claim against the Government he has to come here to Washington and sue before the Court of Claims if the amount involved is over \$10,000. If a man in South Dakota has an honest claim against the Government involving over \$10,000, he has to come to Washington, employ a lawyer, and bring a suit here. The bill extends the jurisdiction to \$100,000, and allows claimants to bring suits in their own districts, where the Government has its own district attorneys and is prepared to defend its own cases. I do not think there

ought to be any limitation at all, but the committee placed the limitation at \$100,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RETIRED PAY FOR CIVIL WAR SERVICE.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 146, the bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade.

Mr. SMOOT. We did not reach that bill to-day, I will say to the Senator. We began with calendar No. 200.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand, but this bill has been passed over several times. If it were the understanding that we should continue the consideration of the calendar until completed, I would not bring it up at this time; but I should like to have it disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that by unanimous consent it was agreed that we should take up the calendar under Rule VIII, beginning with Calendar No. 200.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that was the unanimous-consent agreement, Mr. President, I do not want to violate it.

STEPHEN A. WINCHELL.

The bill (S. 1374) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT.

The bill (S. 3288) further to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations and to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DETACHED SERVICE OF ARMY OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 3238) relating to detached service of officers of the Regular Army was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the termination of the emergency incident to the war with Germany and Austria-Hungary, in the construction of any law relating to detached service of the officers of the Regular Army, all service performed by such officers during the said emergency shall be regarded as service with troops or organizations thereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF AMERICANIZATION.

The bill (S. 3315) to promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several States in the education of non-English-speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign-born residents, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FARM-LOAN ACT.

The bill (H. R. 9065) to amend sections 3, 8, 10, 12, 20, and 21 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we can not consider that bill in the five minutes remaining, and I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDITION ACTS.

The bill (S. 3317) to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States and to prohibit the use of the mails for the purpose of promoting such acts was announced as next in order.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think I will ask that the bill may go over. There are certain Senators very much interested in the bill who are not present. I would like to make a request in regard to the bill. The bill was introduced on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, referred to that committee, and immediately reported back, so that the bill was never printed until after the report of the committee. It has been suggested to me that because of the importance of the subject covered by the bill a little more publicity ought to be given to the measure. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator whether there was a committee report accompanying the bill?

Mr. STERLING. There is no committee report with the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report indicated on my calendar, but I wondered whether a mistake had not been made in printing the calendar.

Mr. STERLING. No; there is no committee report. It was ordered to be reported favorably without amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator intend to submit a report upon the bill?

Mr. STERLING. No; no further report. I would like to say that I would not be quite content to leave the bill on the calendar, and I shall move its consideration at the earliest practicable date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is as follows:

[In the Senate of the United States. Oct. 22 (calendar day, Oct. 27), 1919. Mr. STERLING introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Oct. 22 (calendar day, Oct. 27), 1919. Reported by Mr. STERLING without amendment.]

A bill (S. 3317) to prohibit and punish certain seditious acts against the Government of the United States and to prohibit the use of the mails for the purpose of promoting such acts.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate or advise the overthrow, or to write, or knowingly to print, publish, utter, sell, or distribute any document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication, in or by which there is advised the overthrow, by force or violence, or by physical injury to person or property of the Government of the United States or of all government, or to advise or advocate a change in the form of government or the Constitution of the United States or resistance to the authority thereof by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property, or by force or violence to prevent, hinder, or delay or attempt to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the display or exhibition at any meeting, gathering, or parade, public or private, of any flag, banner, or emblem intended by the person or persons displaying or exhibiting the same to symbolize or indicate a purpose to overthrow by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property, the Government of the United States or all government, is hereby declared to be unlawful.

SEC. 3. That every document, book, circular, paper, journal, or other written or printed communication in or by which there is advocated or advised the overthrow by force or violence or by physical injury to person or property of the Government of the United States or of all government, or in or by which there is advocated or advised the use of force or violence or physical injury to or the seizure or destruction of persons or property as a means toward the accomplishment of economic, industrial, or political changes is hereby declared to be nonmailable and the same shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to authorize any person other than an employee of the Dead Letter Office duly authorized thereto or other person upon a search warrant authorized by law to open any letter not addressed to himself.

SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful to import or cause to be imported into the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable or to transport or cause to be transported any such matter from one State to another or into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 5. That whoever shall use or attempt to use the mails or the Postal Service of the United States for the transmission of any matter declared by section 3 of this act to be nonmailable or who shall violate any other of the provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, and if an alien, shall be, upon the expiration of his sentence, deported from the United States and forever barred from reentering the United States or any Territory under its jurisdiction.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

The bill (H. R. 9821) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DEPORTATION OF UNDESIRABLE ALIENS.

The bill (H. R. 6750) to deport certain undesirable aliens and to deny readmission to those deported was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. This completes the call of the calendar.

RETIRED PAY FOR CIVIL WAR SERVICE.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 146, the bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator tell me why he objects? Mr. KING. Because I do not think the bill has merit, from what I understand of the facts concerning it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service in the regular or volunteer forces prior to April 9, 1865, shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade upon the retired list by reason of such service: *Provided*, That if such advanced rank or rating shall not carry with it an increase of pay of 20 per cent, or if there be no higher enlisted grade to which advancement may be made as herein authorized, then and in such cases said men shall receive an increase of pay of 20 per cent over and above the retired pay actually received by them, respectively, at the time of the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the pay of any person in the Navy or Marine Corps, and that its provisions shall not operate to create any claim for back pay.

SEC. 3. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act be, and are hereby, repealed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will simply read the last paragraph of the report of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Acting Secretary of the Navy. He says:

All the enlisted men (approximately 27) to be benefited by this bill (S. 131) have had at least 30 years' service for enlisted men and are not placed on the retired list unless they have had that amount of service or more. Similar benefits to those provided in this bill were given several years ago to all commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and the Revenue-Cutter Service on the retired list whose records showed creditable Civil War service.

This is to place on the retired list the few remaining in the military service who have had Civil War service. Last August there were about 27 men, and the cost will be between two and three thousand dollars.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The purpose of this bill is, I understand, to give a pensionable status to persons who have served in the Revenue-Cutter Service, giving them the same status as if they had served in the Navy of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; this is not a pension matter at all. It simply provides for their retirement at the next higher grade after they have served 30 years. They are entitled to be retired either at the grade they were then holding or one grade higher. The law gives a higher retirement grade to all the others, and this is recommended as covering these 27.

Mr. KING. But their retirement, if the Senator will pardon me, would call for retirement pay. It would give them an enlarged rate of pay.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and for the whole number it would amount to somewhere about \$2,500 a year. This is simply intended to cover those who served in the Civil War, and who have had 30 years' service. It is not prospective, but covers those who have had that length of service.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator if it is not in line with the scheme which is now proposed to place the Revenue-Cutter Service in the same category with the naval service, giving the revenue-cutter officers the same status as officers in the Navy, the same advantages, the same retirement pay, and so forth?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany in open executive session.

Mr. McCUMBER. I call attention to the fact that it is not 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. But I can make the motion at any time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senate has just voted to take up this bill.

Mr. LODGE. I know, but I do not want it to remain the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The motion of the Senator from Massachusetts is in order.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not yielded to the Senator, and I do not know how he could take me off my feet to make the motion. I admit that at 2 o'clock perhaps another motion may come up, but scarcely at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Of course the arrival of the hour of 2 o'clock does not affect the open executive session. The hour of 2 o'clock applies only to legislative session. The motion I make is a privileged one. I do not want to cut the Senator from North Dakota off, but I do not want to let this bill become the unfinished business, because there are other bills which are more important.

Mr. McCUMBER. Nor do I, Mr. President. I want a vote on it now, if we can dispose of it.

Mr. LODGE. If we can vote on the bill and dispose of it, I have no objection.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the special rule for the morning hour on Monday. However, the hour of 2 o'clock having ar-

rived, the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts is now in order. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany in open executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to call up the unanimous-consent agreement which I presented on Friday and which has been printed, but before doing so I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McLean	Shields
Borah	Harding	McNary	Simmons
Brandeggee	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Owen	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Trammell
Elkins	Keyes	Phelan	Underwood
Fernald	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Pittman	Warren
France	La Follette	Poinexter	Watson
Gay	Lodge	Pomerene	Williams
Gerry	McCormick	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gore	McCumber	Robinson	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on official business. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are absent on account of illness. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained by illness in their families. The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are absent on public business.

I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has gone to Massachusetts to vote at the State election.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement, which I presented on Friday last and which is lying on the desk, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed agreement.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Wednesday, November 12, 1919, the Senate will vote finally upon the resolution of ratification of the pending treaty of peace with Germany; that on and after the calendar day of Monday, November 3, 1919, up to the calendar day of Monday, November 10, 1919, no Senator shall speak more than once nor for a longer period than one hour upon any amendment to the text of the treaty or upon any amendment proposed or that may be proposed to the resolution of ratification, or to any reservation pending or offered thereto; that on and after the calendar day of Monday, November 10, 1919, no Senator shall speak more than once nor for a longer period than 10 minutes upon any amendment pending or offered to the text of the treaty or upon any amendment pending or proposed to the resolution of ratification, or to any reservation proposed to be incorporated therein; that at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of Wednesday, November 12, 1919, debate shall end and voting shall begin and shall be proceeded with until all amendments and reservations and the perfected resolution of ratification have been finally disposed of: *Provided*, That nothing in this agreement shall prevent the Senate from voting upon any amendment or reservation as the same is reached.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say that I shall not insist on any particular date. If the Senate desires to make it earlier, I shall not insist upon the limitations of time set forth nor upon the division of time. There is only one thing that I do insist upon, and that is that the unanimous consent, if entered into, shall be an effective one; that it shall provide for the final vote on the resolution of ratification; that it shall be efficient and effective in that way. That is the only point that I shall insist upon in regard to the proposed agreement. Otherwise, I am entirely ready to modify it as the best judgment of the Senate thinks it should be modified.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the objection to the unanimous-consent agreement asked by the Senator from Massachusetts is a very vital one, so far as the supporters of the treaty

are concerned. It provides for a final vote upon a certain resolution of ratification which has been assented to already by sufficient Senators, so that there is no reasonable chance of materially changing it. If we accepted that proposition we would be in the position of agreeing to vote upon the resolution of ratification as practically already framed by the Senator from Massachusetts and certain of his colleagues, without any power materially to alter that resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Neither this unanimous-consent agreement nor, I think, any unanimous-consent agreement that will be offered, could or would cut off in any way the right to amend or substitute another reservation for any reservation offered. They would all be open to substitution, to amendment, to change, as they were passed, one by one. Of course, the final vote would be on the resolution of ratification in such form as the Senate had agreed upon. That is all the agreement calls for.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, suppose that resolution should fail to receive a two-thirds vote?

Mr. LODGE. Then, of course, as the uniform practice of the Senate shows, it will be open for a motion of reconsideration.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator, then, would construe the rule and the Constitution to mean that no different resolution of ratification could then be proposed.

Mr. LODGE. No different one could be proposed at the same time we were working on the first one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Suppose that one had been defeated, having failed to receive a two-thirds majority vote?

Mr. LODGE. Then, if there was a majority of the Senate that desired to reconsider it, it could be reconsidered and another set of reservations undoubtedly would be offered, I suppose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But except by reconsideration?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know what the parliamentary situation would then be. I can not tell what action would have been taken.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then it is exactly that contingency which we can not afford to consent to. We can not agree that the final vote on the treaty should be had upon a resolution of ratification made up to a large extent by the enemies of the treaty. If the resolution conducted by the Senator from Massachusetts fails to receive a two-thirds vote, we want the opportunity to present another resolution of ratification which may ultimately receive a two-thirds vote, which may receive the vote of the Senators who desire to ratify the treaty without reservations, who may compromise with Senators who desire to ratify the treaty with reservations. We are not willing by unanimous consent to agree that the final vote on the treaty shall be the proposition to pass the resolution framed very largely by those who are the enemies of the treaty.

Mr. President, in taking this position we feel that we are more than justified by the spirit of the Constitution. The Constitution provides that the matter of ratification of a treaty shall be in the hands of two-thirds of the Senate, not in the hands of a majority of the Senate.

The Constitution provides that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting shall be required to assent to the ratification of the treaty, and the rules of the Senate provide that a two-thirds vote is necessary indefinitely to postpone the treaty. It is two-thirds of the Senate and not a bare majority that are entitled to control the vote on this treaty.

Mr. President, I want to say right here that, in my opinion, the treaty will remain before the Senate until the Senate takes definite action upon it. You can postpone it indefinitely by a two-thirds vote, and that will end it for the present so far as the Senate is concerned; you can recommit it to the Committee on Foreign Relations by a majority vote if you want to take that responsibility; the Senate also can displace it by a majority vote by agreeing to a resolution to take up some other measure; but certainly we are entitled to have definite action taken by the Senate, to have Senators assume the responsibility either of indefinite postponement or recommitment or of displacing the treaty by another measure. We are not willing to have the treaty smothered by a bare majority, who have agreed upon a certain resolution of ratification with qualifications that some of us are not able to accept. We feel that we are entitled to have a sincere effort made to see whether it is possible to secure 64 votes here in the Senate for the treaty.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. How does the Senator expect that we shall arrive at a conclusion by the Senate as to what the treaty shall be and when the resolution of ratification shall be adopted except by a majority vote as we proceed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think that is a fair question, and I will explain to the Senator what I think would be the fair, broad-minded way by which every effort could be made to test the real sentiment of the Senate. I believe that can be brought about only, first, by permitting the resolution of ratification as drawn very largely in the Committee on Foreign Relations, modified possibly to some extent here as in Committee of the Whole, to come to a vote. When that vote has been taken, if the resolution receives a two-thirds majority, there is nothing to do except to notify the President that that has been done. If it fails in that form to receive a two-thirds majority, then, there being here in the Senate probably 70 Senators who want the treaty in some form, it certainly seems to me to be the fair thing to permit some of those Senators to present for a vote of the Senate a resolution in such form as they think will receive the assent of a larger number of Senators.

In case the resolution of ratification offered by the Senator from Massachusetts shall fail to receive a two-thirds vote, I believe the next step should be to submit to the Senate a resolution of unqualified ratification, without any provisos or conditions. If that shall fail to receive the necessary two-thirds vote, the fair thing would be to allow Senators to present other resolutions of ratification qualified in such a way as they might receive a larger number of votes; and possibly reach a settlement in that way. If such resolutions fail to receive a two-thirds vote, then it is up to the Senate to decide what to do with the treaty. We shall then have tested out in a fair, broad way the sentiment of the Senate.

I am not sure that ratification will be reached in any form; but if Senators desire that the matter now be handled in a way which the magnitude and dignity of the great question require instead of by the methods of a political convention, in which a bare majority binds itself to stand by a certain resolution and if that resolution fails the whole thing fails, I think the method which I have suggested would be much more in accordance with the dignity and importance of this great question and would settle it.

There is no settlement of the question if the Senate is confined merely to a vote upon the proposition presented by the Senator from Massachusetts, backed probably by a bare majority. It simply shows what a majority will do. It neither indefinitely postpones the treaty nor does it supplant it by anything else. The method which I propose would bring about a settlement.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall object to the request for unanimous consent presented by the Senator from Massachusetts, and, in place of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I presented to the Senate on Friday last, I offer another suggestion for a unanimous-consent agreement. If the Senate will permit, I shall read it, as it is not in printed form, and shall read it slowly, so that it may be fairly understood:

First. That after the adoption of this unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will meet each day at 11 o'clock a. m. for the consideration of the German treaty and all amendments, reservations, or resolutions of ratification that may be proposed. No Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes during the present week upon any pending question.

Second. That during the calendar day of Monday, November 3, 1919, before adjournment or recess, the Senate will vote upon the pending amendment and also upon any other amendments to the treaty that may be offered.

Third. That during the calendar days of Tuesday and Wednesday, November 4 and 5, 1919, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, will consider committee reservations, which consideration may be continued not later than the calendar day of Thursday, November 6, 1919, at 3 o'clock p. m., before or at which time a vote upon pending committee reservations shall be taken, whereupon the treaty shall be reported to the Senate by the Committee of the Whole.

Fourth. In the Senate the vote upon the resolution of ratification, embracing such reservations as have been adopted in Committee of the Whole, shall take place before adjournment or recess of the calendar day of Thursday, November 6, 1919.

Fifth. If it receives the necessary two-thirds vote, the President shall be notified.

Sixth. If it does not receive the necessary two-thirds vote, the Senate shall consider on Friday, November 7, and Saturday, November 8, 1919, any resolutions of ratification proposed by the minority of the Foreign Relations Committee and vote upon the same not later than 3 o'clock p. m., Saturday, November 8, 1919. If no such resolution receives the necessary two-thirds vote, it shall then be in order for any Senator to propose a resolution of ratification during the calendar day and the same shall be voted upon without discussion. If no such resolution receives the necessary two-thirds vote, it shall thereupon be in order for any Senator to move to take up the railroad bill or any other business, and this question shall be decided without discussion.

Mr. President, that provides for bringing the matter to a head this week. It puts the Senate in a position where on next Saturday, by a mere majority vote, if no resolution of ratification

has been accepted, it can set aside the treaty for the present and take up the railroad bill or any other important legislation. It distributes fairly well the time on the reservations and on the pending amendment, giving, of course, the lion's share of time to the reservations proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations as they may be modified as in Committee of the Whole. If two-thirds of the Senate do not agree to the resolution of ratification which the Senator from Massachusetts fathers, it then gives the other sentiment in the Senate an opportunity to present its case to the Senate and ask for a vote, first, probably upon an unqualified resolution of ratification; and if that shall be defeated, then upon another resolution of ratification with such qualifications and restrictions and reservations as may be necessary to unite 64 votes in the Senate in the support of the resolution.

I think that is a fair proposition. It will, I repeat, bring the matter to an end this week. It will have the effect of giving the best possible opportunity to test out the sentiment of the Senate on the subject of ratification. It does away with the idea that a mere majority can tie up a resolution here and say to the remainder of the Senate, "If you do not approve this, the treaty is at an end." The very idea of reservations is to give an opportunity for a compromise of diverse opinions.

Mr. President, there is a very honest difference of opinion as to the terms on which this treaty should be ratified. The time has come when we have got to look the situation fairly in the face, and we find that unless a compromise between these diverse views is reached the treaty can not be ratified, but it places the responsibility where it belongs.

There is another thing that it does. It gives to the Senators here who believe in the treaty in some form an opportunity to reach a compromise. As it is, it is well known that the pending resolution of ratification, with the reservations already agreed to, represents particularly the views of Senators who are going to vote against the treaty even when those reservations are attached to it. It does not represent the Senators here who want to ratify the treaty; and, while it is perfectly proper for them to inject their views into the resolution of ratification, it is not fair play to prevent Senators from voting on another resolution of ratification.

Senators may say that we can amend the resolution of ratification fathered by the Senator from Massachusetts; but the Senator from Massachusetts has assured me, and other Senators associated with him have assured me, that they have the vote to hold it right where it is; they have the pledges of Senators to stand by that resolution. Very well; let that resolution come to a vote in the Senate. If it can muster a two-thirds vote, the treaty is entitled to ratification in that form; but if it can not muster a two-thirds vote, certainly we ought to have the opportunity to present a resolution in a different form, and we should not adopt the methods of a political convention in preventing a fair expression of the average opinion of the Senators here in the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, for the consideration of the Senate, I offer the request for unanimous consent which I have read.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the only methods that I have adopted are the methods laid down by the rules and by the practice of the Senate of the United States in dealing with treaties. Let me first draw a distinction, which the Senator from Nebraska omitted to draw but which is vital, between the resolution of ratification and the reservations or conditions which are attached to it. The resolution of ratification is the enacting clause, and, of course, is the same in all cases, whether it stops with simple consent and advice or whether it goes on and imposes conditions. The Senator would have to use it for his reservations if he proposes to attach any to the treaty; he would have to use it if he proposes to ratify the treaty without reservation. That is the resolution of ratification. The reservations are what are in discussion here.

It is true that the Constitution gave to one-third of the Senate, or one more than one-third, power to defeat a treaty; but it did not give them control of the reservations or amendments, or of the form in which the treaty should go to the question of ratification. That is left to a majority. The Senator's proposition is that the majority must not have its way; that the people who are to decide must be the one more than one-third; and, of course, they can have their way as to whether the treaty shall be ratified or not, no matter what form it may take.

Now, Mr. President, we consider the reservations. As I have said, they are open to every form of amendment and substitution. Each will be considered separately. They will then be taken into the Senate, and again they will be open to a separate vote on each one, and to any amendment, and to any substitution. Then the reservations or amendments, if there should be any, agreed upon by the Senate in Committee of the Whole and in

the Senate, are placed upon the enacting clause, which is then put at the head of them, and that is submitted to the Senate for a final vote as to whether the resolution in that form shall pass. There has been every opportunity to do everything that the Senator wishes to have done. If the resolution fails in that form to receive the vote of two-thirds of the Senate, it is then open to reconsideration if a majority favors reconsideration, and it can be brought back here as it stands, with the reservations or amendments, if there are any, attached to it; and the Senate then has an opportunity, and the minority who have voted against ratification have the opportunity, to deal with it under the rules.

Mr. President, those are the parliamentary methods and the methods pursued by the Senate in all cases where treaties have had reservations, or where they have been proposed, or where there has been rejection of a resolution and subsequent reconsideration. I see no reason to go beyond those rules. I do not believe for a moment that it is possible under parliamentary law to take a resolution of any sort, or a bill, and lay one form after another beside it, and keep voting on indefinite propositions. The whole basis of parliamentary law is to promote the transaction of business with a view of bringing it to a conclusion. Now, it is not a final conclusion, of course, but the first conclusion we can reach is on an enacting resolution with such amendments or reservations as the Senate chooses to put on. That is the first step toward final action. I think that action ought to be taken. I should be glad to take it on the 6th, or the 10th, or any date that the Senate may decide; but I am not going into any elaborate piecemeal scheme of this sort. I want to get some kind of definite action, and have the resolution of ratification either carried or lost. Then, if reconsideration is desired, whenever the majority chooses to take it up, it can bring up the resolution again and try it once more; but I am not going to vote for a lot of piecemeal agreements. I want to get a vote on the resolution with the reservations that the Senate sees fit to adopt now, after full consideration; and I shall object to any other form that does not carry with it a definite time for voting on a resolution of ratification in such form as the Senate chooses to make it. I think this other agreement, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, produces no end at all. The country wants this treaty either voted up or voted down.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there were Senators on the other side of the Chamber and Senators on this side of the Chamber who have been designated as "mild reservationists." They held quite different views from the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee. They were antagonistic to many of the reservations presented by the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee. I understand, however, that they have agreed to vote for those reservations under the belief that only by voting for such reservations may a sufficient number of votes be commanded to get any action at all. For that reason, and for that reason only, they will vote for these reservations. If these reservations are adopted as a part of the resolution of ratification by a majority vote, and if then they do not succeed in accomplishing the ratification of the treaty by the necessary two-thirds vote, those mild reservationists are not going to stop there if they have a legal opportunity to go further. They will have satisfied their obligations to the majority on the other side of the Chamber; they will have voted with the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the resolution of ratification will have failed in that form. Will it not then be the desire of the mild reservationists on that side of the Chamber to offer a reservation which will possibly appeal to two-thirds of this body? If the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts goes through, there will be no such opportunity to the mild reservationists on that side of the Chamber or on this side of the Chamber.

In other words, there are Senators on this side of the Chamber who do not believe in any reservations. Those Senators probably will vote against all reservations; and yet, as one of those very Senators who would vote against all reservations, I would not like to be foreclosed from the privilege of voting for interpretative reservations if it turned out to be the only way in which the treaty could be ratified. Yet if the plan of the Senator from Massachusetts is adopted, I will vote against such reservations and I will vote against the resolution of ratification containing those reservations, and if there are a third of this body voting the same way that I do the resolution will be defeated, and that is to be the end of the treaty under the plan submitted. If it is demonstrated that that resolution was defeated by reason of the character of the reservations in it, and I am convinced that we can not ratify the treaty without reservations, and the Senator from North Dakota should then offer his reservations or some other Senator should offer his interpretative reservations, I would feel justified then in joining those Senators in voting for

a compromise resolution. I would be debarred of this opportunity under Senator LODGE's plan. It could be accomplished under Senator HITCHCOCK's plan.

There is not any chance on earth, and the Senator from Massachusetts knows it, of ever ratifying this treaty with the reservations that he now presents to the Senate. I do not think he has in his mind for one moment that he can get two-thirds of the Senate to vote for the resolution of ratification containing those reservations, and yet he seeks to force a final vote upon the treaty upon the vote upon those reservations. He wants to prevent the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Georgia from offering interpretative reservations that may command the votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. He does not desire to give the Senators on this side who will first vote against all reservations another chance to vote for mild reservations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I could not possibly cut off Senators from offering any reservations they wanted to, even if I desired to do so, and I have no such desire.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator has said that, but it does not meet the point. They can offer substitutes or amendments before the vote on the resolution submitted by the Senator. They can do it beforehand, but they can not do it afterwards. That is exactly the distinction I am making.

Mr. LODGE. They can not offer them after the resolution is agreed to, can they?

Mr. PITTMAN. Nor can they offer any other resolution, under the plan proposed by the Senator, after his is defeated.

Mr. LODGE. Why, certainly, they can.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is exactly the position the Senator is trying to put us in.

Mr. LODGE. They can move reconsideration, bring it back, and consider it all over again, if they want to.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is trying to deprive the Senators in this body who desire the treaty ratified as it is of any opportunity to compromise after his resolution of ratification is defeated. That is the purpose of it, and that will be the accomplishment of it, if the Senator succeeds. He desires us to vote our honest convictions now, with no opportunity, after the resolution is defeated, to enter into a compromise with any other Senators in this body. That is the whole purpose of it. That will be the result of it.

Mr. LODGE. I am proceeding simply according to the rules. I know no other way. I can not change the rules in the middle of the game, as seems to be proposed. I am following the rules as they stand. There will be every opportunity for everybody to offer any compromise or other reservations that they want to. There is no other way of getting at it that I know of. All I want to do is to get a vote; and if these reservations that I propose are beaten, and a majority does not vote for them, then we can come to a vote on the treaty without reservations or with other reservations; but let us get a vote. That is what I want.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is true the Senator wants a vote, but he wants a vote in a manner that is certain to defeat this treaty. He says that we may offer our amendments to his resolution. Yes; that is true; but he knows that those amendments will be defeated. The Senator from North Dakota could offer his substitute reservations, but he knows that they will be defeated. He knows that everything is tied up for the defeat of anything that might accomplish a compromise in this body, and then he wants to force before this body on a final vote something that he knows will defeat the treaty. That is the purpose of it. He says he is simply following the rules. Why, the Senator knows that by unanimous consent you can set aside any rule, and that is exactly what the Senator from Nebraska has asked the Senator to do. He has asked him to set aside the rules so that after the vote is taken upon the Senator's resolution, if it does not get the necessary two-thirds, we may take a vote on a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, and then, if that does not get the necessary two-thirds, we can vote on a resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota. That is what he asks. Those rules can be changed by unanimous consent, and the Senator need not worry about that if he is simply trying to accomplish action.

Mr. LODGE. The rules can not be changed by unanimous consent, and will not be, of course. I have no reason to know that the treaty with these reservations attached, or the important ones among them attached, will not be ratified. On the contrary, I have always believed that it would be.

I have tried to bring about reservations which would lead to the ratification of the treaty. If they are voted down, and voted down by those who profess to be the friends of the treaty,

no matter what rule you have, or what rule you abolish, you can not abolish the Constitution, and the treaty will be in great danger.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am taking no part in the form of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I am, however, very deeply interested in a subject which will be vitally affected by the arrangement that is proposed. I am for any sort of unanimous-consent agreement that will dispose finally of the treaty during the present week.

I bring to the attention of Senators a situation which is so grave that it ought to be uppermost in our minds when we are considering at what time the present subject shall be disposed of. Nine months ago, substantially, the President of the United States declared that not later than the 1st of January now approaching he would feel it his duty to return the railways of the country to their owners, under a power which he undoubtedly possesses. I have good reason to believe that his purpose at that time has not been changed. I can not speak positively with regard to his intent, but I am led to think that about the first of the approaching January these properties will be returned to their owners. Nor could anyone criticize the President with much severity, because we have had ample opportunity to prepare and enact into law the legislation which I regard as absolutely necessary in the return of our systems of transportation to their owners.

I do not criticize anybody for the time taken in the debate upon the treaty. It is of the mightiest consequence. I have never uttered a word of complaint with regard to it. But I think it has been debated sufficiently. I know that every Senator has made up his mind with regard to the votes which he shall cast, either upon the proposed amendments or reservations, or upon the ratification. In view of the impending calamity—and it will be a calamity from which we can not escape, if the railroads are returned to their owners without adequate and sufficient legislation—in view of that situation, the German treaty ought to be disposed of, and I have not ventured to think, even, that the consideration of it could be, or would be, prolonged beyond the present week.

If the railroads are returned to their owners without adequate legislation, you will not only see an intensification of all of the difficulties which are now observed in the labor world, but, in my judgment, you will witness a financial catastrophe against which it will be very hard for us to contend. It is our bounden duty, if it be within our possibilities, to pass before this session ends the legislation which we think is necessary to properly take care of the situation; and I, for one, would feel that I had done less than my duty if I did not use all of the means at my command to induce the Senate to take up this subject for consideration within a very brief time.

I have not attempted to bring it forward, because I have believed that we ought to dispose of the German treaty; but we have reached now a situation, and I want fairly to advise Senators, in which I shall feel it to be my responsibility and my duty to ask that the German treaty be displaced, if I can not be assured in some manner that the railroads will not be returned to their owners in the absence of adequate and protective legislation.

I do not know just when I ought to do that. I have been waiting day after day, hoping that the debate upon the treaty might be brought to a conclusion. But so seriously do I view the subject of what are the consequences of passing over into the next year without legislation on this subject that if it becomes apparent that the German treaty is to be delayed, and is to claim the attention of the Senate during all of this session and part of the next, I shall have no doubt with regard to my duty in the premises.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. JONES of Washington addressed the Chair.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say that I entirely appreciate the feeling of the Senator from Iowa. I sympathize with him. I shall be glad to see the resolution of ratification with reservations voted on upon Saturday next, if I can bring it about.

That at least would make procedure along parliamentary lines and it would take one long step to finish it; but I can not agree to a unanimous-consent request that leaves this thing open to indefinite postponement and talk of compromise, trying to arrange here and there, behind the doors and in the cloak-rooms, a compromise which will consume more time than has been already consumed. I shall object to that form of agreement.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was not in the least criticizing the position of the Senator from Massachusetts. He has told me for the last several weeks that he desired to do everything in his

power to bring the debate to a close, and I know that that has been his purpose. I do not want to leave the German treaty until it is finally disposed of. I am entirely in sympathy with that view.

I do not quite comprehend the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]; but whatever is done, no matter what course is pursued, let us agree upon something that will dispose of this treaty, so far as its consideration by the Senate is concerned, within this week, if that be possible. If there are Senators who think that the debate ought to be continued, and that it can not be disposed of in justice to its great importance until the next session, then let us lay it aside and take up for consideration a subject that must be disposed of if we are to protect the people of this country in their transportation facilities before the first of the year. Now I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to see the treaty disposed of soon. I am ready to vote at any time. I understand, I think, the importance of the railroad legislation; but I want to ask the Senator if there is any law requiring the Railroad Administration to turn the railroads back to private parties by the 1st of January?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no such law. The President has the power to return them; and I venture to suggest that while, if I were in his stead, I would not return them until adequate legislation is enacted, yet there are a great many reasons which move one in that direction. At this time there is almost complete demoralization in the railway service. The employees, knowing that the time is approaching for the return of the properties to their former owners, can not maintain that degree of efficiency which ought to be manifest in all such service. The railway companies are utterly incapable of doing anything, for they have nothing with which to accomplish any purpose. The properties are not in their possession; the working capital is not in their possession; they are unable even to prepare fairly for the approaching return of the properties. There is every consideration for the rapid disposition of the subject, and we can not vindicate ourselves to the people of the country unless we do take such measures as are necessary and adequate to accomplish the purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to get the opinion of the Senator as to the amount of time which will probably be consumed in the consideration of his railroad bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not attempted to make an estimate along that line, but it has seemed to me that the Senate ought to be able to dispose of it within three weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. What the Senate ought to be able to do and what it does in actual practice are divergent things.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not disposed to deny that.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator if he has the impression that if we should take up the railroad bill next week we could dispose of it before the holidays?

Mr. CUMMINS. If we should take up the railroad bill next Monday, I think we could dispose of it by the end of November.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not so optimistic as that, by any means; but I am willing to try it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want to try it.

Mr. THOMAS. I will aid the Senator all I can by keeping as quiet as possible during the interval, if that will help any. I suggest to the Senator that he make the railroad bill the unfinished business, and we can then devote to it the morning hour when we adjourn instead of recessing, and by that means we will make a little progress. In any event, we will create some diversion for the galleries by relieving them of the monotony of treaty consideration.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the railroad question will not furnish the charming and delightful forays into the history of the world that we have witnessed in the treaty debate. I think that when we take it up for consideration the galleries will empty pretty rapidly. But however that may be, all I want is that Senators, in coming to a conclusion with regard to what kind of an agreement should be made to bring the German treaty to an end, will have in mind the situation which confronts us so far as our railways are concerned. I am willing to agree to anything so far as the distribution of time and length of debate are concerned that will bring the consideration of the treaty to an end this week; and when it is brought to an end it ought to be at an end for the time being, at any rate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether the unanimous-consent agreement submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was objected to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to make a formal objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I so understood. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, what I desire to say will be in the line of the regular order, and I want to address a question to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

I should very much like to have adopted the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska. I appreciate the fact that it is very difficult to make an arrangement whereby a minority may have a second chance if they fail to secure their wish on the first opportunity. Inasmuch as under the regular rules of the Senate there is only one way of registering the opinion of a minority, and that is by a vote upon each proposition as it comes up, as an amendment, and a final vote either on accepting the result or voting against the proposition as it comes before the Senate at that time, and as we can not make the change then, I know of no way under the rule whereby the minority can get another opportunity to register its views in another manner unless we have unanimous consent.

Now, I am satisfied that there are those who are so bitterly opposed to the treaty that they will never give unanimous consent to anything that would take from them any advantage they may have. Therefore I think it is useless for the Senator or anyone else to attempt to secure an agreement which would allow the Senate to vote upon the reservations, or the resolution containing reservations, and, if they are defeated and if they can not get a reconsideration of that vote, then to have unanimous consent that they could try the whole matter over; and that is really what the unanimous-consent request of the Senator means.

If that is an impossibility, if we have got to meet this issue, it seems to me we might just as well meet it at one time as another in agreeing upon a day certain, and if we can not, by any possibility, change the proposed reservations to suit us, then the question will have to be put up to the Senate whether they wish to vote for or against those reservations as they shall appear in the resolution at that time. I am ready to meet it.

I think there is a little error about the unanimity of understanding concerning the reservations that have been printed. The first four or five of them I shall support. I shall support them because I feel confident that we can not get 64 votes for the treaty unless we have them, and that is the only reason that guides me in supporting them. If I should vote for the resolution of ratification as it is finally formulated, and that resolution should fail to receive the 64 votes necessary, I have enough interest in the treaty, and hope that upon a reconsideration it might be modified so that we could get the vote, to move of my own volition to reconsider the vote by which it passed. But I recognize the fact that a majority can vote that down, and I do not know of any way to escape it.

I am not in favor of every one of the reservations. I am opposed to the preamble or a portion of the preamble to the reservations, and I am opposed to one or two of the reservations, and so I notified my colleagues when they passed upon them in the committee that I would reserve the right to oppose them in the Senate.

So after all it seems to me that we might as well agree first as last upon a date, if we are going to attempt to get the treaty disposed of in a reasonable time, for I am certain that those who are opposed to the treaty in any form will not consent to give the Senator from Nebraska the advantage which he hopes for.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that while I was off the floor for a moment some question was raised about my making objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I did make objection or intended to make objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Massachusetts had objected, and so stated.

Mr. FERNALD obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Maine if he will give way to me for a few remarks connected with a matter which has been under consideration?

Mr. FERNALD. I have been waiting for some little time to proceed. I should like to go on at this time if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I offer no apology for the action I am about to take toward the solution of the great question now before this Senate. For weeks a fair and open discussion has taken place by those who earnestly favor the league of nations and the treaty of peace. It has been my desire from the beginning to endeavor in every way possible so to perfect this document that it might meet my passive approval. I have never ardently espoused the cause of the league of nations, for I see in it many provisions which I deem dangerous to the liberties of a free people, and especially to the liberties of our own Republic. The President of the United States, with his ad-

visers, spent weeks in foreign lands in a company of statesmen and representatives of other and foreign governments in coming to an agreement and what he deemed a just solution of the matter. I do not question his sincerity and realize the difficulty under which he labored in the meeting of so many diversified minds and opinions.

Doubtless in the circumstances he did the best he could. If I were to criticize his action at all it would be in his selection of delegates to represent this country abroad on a matter of such vital interest to our people. Had he taken men even from his own party altogether, or such as might be found on either side of this Chamber, I believe that a document might have been produced which in every respect would be more acceptable to this Senate and to the American people than that which we now have before us. This, however, is a question of the past, and criticism at this time is, perhaps, out of order, quite futile, and unnecessary.

But this treaty or contract between nations is before us with a statement from the administration that should any changes of a material nature be made the force of the entire document would be annulled. I can not agree, Mr. President, to this view. I believe that the wisdom of this Senate may be relied upon to make some changes which would bring this within the approval of those who must ratify it before it can be enforced. I shall not attempt in detail to discuss all of the many articles of the treaty, because they have already been discussed by the Members of the Senate, and the very fact that this body is fairly evenly divided in the matter proves beyond cavil that some changes must be made before we can come to an agreement and ratify the treaty.

I do not intend to thrash over old straw, because it would seem that every kernel of wheat has been taken from it. Senators on both sides of the Chamber has agreed that many of the treaty provisions are not only unfair, unreasonable, and unjust, but entirely illegal and unconstitutional. I do not, of course, offer any suggestions along legal or constitutional lines. The Senate has already been enlightened on both sides of the question by able constitutional lawyers. It is in a spirit of fairness and entirely from a business man's standpoint that I shall attempt to discuss these matters. But in doing so I do not feel that I must make any observations to excuse any vote I may take or to place myself properly before my constituents. The people of my State—like those, I assume, of other States—are not of one opinion, and disagree as to the action they would like me and my colleague to take. It is a matter of some regret to me that I must oppose my colleague in this matter. He and I do not agree entirely in the method of solving this question, and I concede to him the same right to his opinion that I claim for my own. In our discussions there will be no resentment or feeling of disregard on my part, and I am sure he shares the same feeling. He represents, I assume, the sentiment of many honest, well-meaning, intelligent people of our State. Just how our constituents would divide on this matter I am unable to say; but I do feel that the position I take on this question will meet the approval of some at least—and I trust of many—of the business men not only of my own State but of the entire country.

I do not even share the belief that great speed should be made in the solution of this matter. I have felt entirely satisfied with the progress we have made and with the leadership of both eminent Senators on each side of the Chamber. I want to say here and now that the people of this country, even though they desire prompt and speedy action on most matters, feel that in this particular case, where we are about to enter into a contract with the nations of the world that is not temporary but enduring, it is far better that careful deliberation be given than that any hasty action be taken. I, of course, desire to expedite this discussion and the consideration as much as is consistent with its scope and magnitude and the far-reaching effect of its solution in its relation to our people. Many Senators have already expressed themselves on this question; and I am quite willing to wait in patience in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to make such observations as they may see fit, and that all such shall have due and just consideration. I hold that in the final disposition of this matter no partisan spirit will be shown, because the settlement of this great question is far above partisanship or any political aggrandizement. It is an American question and should be settled by Americans in an American way.

Before discussing the merits or demerits of amendments or reservations to be made to this treaty I want to say that I do not deem it such a holy and sanctified instrument as some Members of the Senate would have it appear.

Nor do I believe it necessary that any provisions be made whereby the treaty may not be sent back for further consideration by the Governments interested and the signatories to the

document. While I have very tender compassion for the sentiments of other people, I have a much greater regard for the feelings of my own countrymen. And if it seem necessary in making the changes that this document be returned to the signers for consideration, I shall vote to send it back to them with a much greater respect for my own judgment than to have either mild or stringent reservations made that would insure its adoption. I have not opposed—in fact, I am very much in favor of—amendments that shall be made in the body of the document. I believe in meeting these matters squarely and fairly, and that every signatory should understand well and without question just the position this Government is taking in making this treaty. I do not agree with those who think that reservations will be passed without consideration. Every act of this Senate and every word in any reservation will be as carefully scanned by the other powers as if amendments were made. I have preferred amendments rather than reservations.

But there are those who think that by making such reservation as they deem will protect the interests of our Government it will not be necessary to have further consideration, and that the powers of the earth will accept it without further controversy. And that seems the only excuse given by those who advocate reservations in the place of amendments. If we are to make a contract with a party, why not embody in that contract every act that we intend to perform, have it well understood, that there may be no controversy in the future regarding it? In fact, I believe that some provisions that I desire can not be made by reservation, but that it will be necessary to have amendments before the contract will meet with my approval. I may stand alone in this, but if I do, it is my constitutional right; and I would rather stand alone and feel that I am right and justified in my stand than to accept that which I deem unwise, unfair, unjust, unrighteous, and dangerous to American interests and institutions.

In the ratification of the instrument before us we are departing from the policies laid down by the founders of the Government and the makers of the Constitution and those early founders of the Republic who, looking down through the ages, never dreamed of such entangling alliances as this document stipulates. Coming fresh from the different Governments where they had been under the dominion of monarchs, and suffering from the autocracy and the environments under which they had lived, they advised against such alliances. As has been so often referred to in this Chamber, Washington, in his parting address and in the inspired words, almost of a prophet, warned us against the very doctrines which are embodied in this treaty. Every one of the statesmen of that day, knowing full well the desire of the great governments of the earth to court our friendship and engage our assistance, made plain in the most convincing language the danger of such alliances. For 130 years we have followed the teachings of our fathers, and in that time the Old World has been honeycombed with intrigues, revolutions, uprisings, and wars. But this Republic, standing alone, going straight forward in the course laid down by the founders, has kept its bearings, grown in national wealth and prosperity, and to-day we present a country that is the wonder and the admiration of the world.

It is a matter of gratifying pride to me to know that whenever our Government has been threatened by foreign aggression the North and South, the East and the West, have sprung to arms and have been ready as one man to come to the rescue. It matters not how humble a citizen of this country, if he has sworn allegiance to the flag, whether he be black or white, red or yellow, poor or rich, as a citizen of this country, he may feel an absolute security under the flag and in the power and majesty of its protection.

This country has never made an aggressive war; it is only when our property and lives have been in danger or taken that we have offered resentment. I can not agree with those who claim that the war with Germany was solely for the "safety of democracy"; I voted to declare war on Germany because she had destroyed our property, insulted our flag, murdered our citizens, sent our men and women to the bottom of the sea. And it is in such cases only that our Government will rise to arms and resort to force. But when that occasion arises, we have in this great Republic of ours sons whom America can depend upon to defend the flag; and no nobler men nor more vigorous fighters can be found on the face of the earth.

We have no great standing Army. Our Navy has not been the largest in the world. But when it comes to heroism and courage, that nation is yet unborn which can stand before our soldiers in open honorable battle. And we need not fear a coalition of the nations of the earth to destroy the United States, because all the powers combined of hell and earth can not, on our own soil, meet us with any expectancy of victory.

I make this not as a challenge, because I desire peace at all times, but simply to assure those who are fearful of what may come to us in the event that this league of nations is not ratified. And our boys are ready at a moment's call. They may drill with broomsticks, they may be called upon untrained and unequipped, but when Uncle Sam gives the word they are ready to spring to action, and will never be found wanting. They are not ready to obey the command of some foreign potentate. And if this league of nations is accepted, the mothers who gave so nobly their heroic sons in defense of their country will again be called to make the sacrifice, because as sure as the sun rises and sets we will be forced to send our soldiers to every field of battle on the face of the globe where war is imminent.

And in these days when we are supposed to be at peace, and as a Nation are at peace, there are scores of little wars going on in the distant and far-off countries of the Old World. In Siberia—in fact, in almost every quarter of Asia—little armies to-day are fighting and men are dying, and this league contemplates sending our men to quell every outburst or uprising. If this be not its intention, why does the administration suggest that we support an army of 500,000 men and spend millions in construction of battleships and in training our soldiers? What else are armies and navies expected to do but to fight? The very fact that they have asked for large appropriations for this purpose proves beyond a question of doubt that we are expected to enter these conflicts. And those well-meaning people, those churches, who have resolved that this treaty should be ratified without a change believe that the league of nations to enforce peace will stop all further war. Oh, what a delirious, Utopian dream! How I wish that it would accomplish this. But it is certain to do just the opposite. When we enter into a contract to protect the territorial integrity of other nations, no matter what the conditions may be, no matter how much a people may desire liberty and freedom, we must aid the government with whom we are in alliance and to whom we have promised assistance.

Recently in this body soldiers of Irish birth have been ridiculously maligned—these people who for years have had the desire for liberty; these people who have been under the English yoke and have striven for liberty and have made the most righteous demands; these people who stood beside the patriots in this country during the Revolution and in the War of 1812. I can not conscientiously vote for the ratification of the covenant so long as it does not make proper provision and give assurance to the Irish people which my sense of right demands. No assurance is given which indicates that the league can settle the problems of this people striving for self-determination and who may and probably will demand recognition in the future. I want such provision incorporated in the document.

This covenant in its present form pledges members of the league to the aid of other members; hence, in the event of Ireland's striving to wrest her freedom from England, the United States would be unable to aid her and must support Great Britain, the latter being a member of the league. Regardless of how much our sympathies might be with Ireland, no matter how dear the cause of Ireland to the 20,000,000 Americans of Irish blood in this country, under this treaty we should be forced to aid Great Britain, and this despite the fact that this Senate, by a vote of 60 to 1, adopted the resolution asking for a hearing as to the situation of affairs in Ireland. This hearing was denied at Paris, and the same influences that refused the hearing will be at work in the council of the league.

In passing let me say that I wish to register my regret for and my disapproval of the reckless assertion regarding the aid rendered by the Irish in the Revolutionary War. Historians have proven to us that 38 per cent of the Revolutionary Army was Irish, and we know that the Civil War furnished its full quota of Irish soldiers, and no one need be told that in the World War the Irish name was conspicuous and Irish courage unquestioned.

And for the part which the Irish race has taken in the solution of these great questions, in their loyalty and patriotism, their indomitable courage and their allegiance to the flag of their adoption, we owe them a debt of gratitude that can not be overestimated. I will never vote to ratify any document that will withhold from America the privilege of at least extending to this splendid race its moral and sympathetic support.

I have voted for every amendment which would, in my judgment, make this document less objectionable.

To my mind the situation regarding Shantung is a disgrace and a crime. America has ever stood for equal, economic opportunity for China and for her territorial integrity and independence as a nation. The attitude of the United States in this respect has been above reproach, and I can not bear to think

that the American people will stand for injustice or will willingly sanction or permit it. I want America to keep her record unblemished and unstained. But if the control of Shantung is permitted to be given Japan, that record, in my eyes, will be blemished and our standard lowered. China is one of the richest countries on the face of the earth. She is the source of immense supply for minerals, including iron, copper, coal, silver, and gold. She is a still greater reservoir of men. Her population is estimated at 300,000,000. Added to this are her endowments of favorable climate and unsurpassed fertility of soil. Naturally enough, in her weakness and civil strife and her condition of partially lost independence, China is a great temptation to a power of autocratic militarism like Japan, who more than any other nation is vitally interested in China's fate. Because of geographical propinquity Japan has a strong advantage and has come to feel a sort of claim to China. This ever-growing power over China is naturally productive of bad feeling between the two peoples. Hence, the Chinese detest the Japs and the Japs despise the Chinese and covet China's possession. This tension has been materially heightened by the Paris proceedings.

America's traditional policy has always been to preserve the independence of her neighbor and to aid the best element to achieve national regeneration, and to me it seems incredible that our country will depart from that policy and permit a weak but friendly nation, an ally in the recent war, to become the prey of a rival and ambitious power, and the possible cause of another world war. China is our sister Republic, as much as the suffering nations of Europe, and despite her ignorance and her weakness it is our duty to play our part in lending her aid and assistance. I for one can not vote to ratify the peace treaty without a strong and separate protest against the Shantung provision.

What, you say, no amendment can be offered and no provision made that will aid China or right the wrong perpetrated by Japan?

But unless some expression can be given to the sentiment of our people, which I am sure is almost unanimous, I am not willing to give this treaty my approval. I have voted for 40 amendments already, each in its turn to be defeated, and such, I assume, is to be the fate of every amendment, no matter how just or how much it might improve the covenant, because some with their tender mercy for other peoples can not permit such amendments to be made as will necessitate its return for consideration by other powers. Last week the Senator from California offered an amendment that would give to the United States equal representation in the league with Great Britain. There was no question. I assume, in the mind of anyone but that it was a just amendment, and to my mind it ought to have been accepted. I can not conceive of any citizen of our country refusing to vote to give our Government equal power with that of any other government on earth. From a standpoint of moral right and justice our Government, in my judgment, following a similar procedure to that employed in determining representation of other self-governing colonies, ought to have 48 votes—every State in this Union should be represented. To be sure, our States are not dominions nor colonies any more, but they are self-governing political bodies. We hold our elections for the governor and members of the legislature precisely as the Dominion of Canada holds her elections for the selection of Governor General and the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FERNALD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. I wonder if the Senator has noticed the statement of a member of the Canadian House of Commons and for 16 years a member of the Canadian cabinet that New York is far more important to the Union than Canada to the British Empire.

Mr. FERNALD. I am going to take that up just a little later. I thank the Senator for the suggestion.

Mr. President, in every sense our States are self-governing political bodies, and are bound by the Union of States practically as Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and India are bound to the British Empire. We ought to have 48 votes in the league, both as a matter of right and to give some assurance that the questions which come up for consideration embracing almost every question in the world may be considered by the most intelligent, fair, and honorable body of citizens that may be found on the face of the globe. Some of our States are so much larger and are so much more in importance than the colonies which are represented by the 6 votes of Great Britain that there is no comparison. In fact, New York is much larger in population than the Dominion of Canada.

Her population of more than 10,000,000 represents the finest type of American citizenship. The Dominion of Canada has a population of 8,300,000, while little New Zealand has less than 1,000,000. The commerce of New York is equal to that of a hemisphere half a century ago, and last year the business, as represented by the imports and exports, was more than \$5,000,000,000, while that of New Zealand was \$250,000,000, which shows New York's business to be more than twenty times as great as that of New Zealand and twelve times the business done by South Africa, whose exports and imports were but \$400,000,000, and seven times that of Australia, whose exports and imports were but \$680,000,000; and yet New York has but one forty-eighth of the numerical strength in voting power in the league of nations that New Zealand has. Pennsylvania, with her population of 8,000,000, has no voting power of its own, except the one vote of the United States, as compared with Australia with a population of 4,120,000, exclusive of aborigines.

Think of Illinois, Ohio, and Texas, with a combined population of 13,000,000 souls, with their splendid institutions of learning, their great industrial centers, their marvelous resources, their fertile fields, their citizenship, as high as can be found under the sun, sitting passively by and permitting the colored representative of Liberia or Siam to cast his vote in the great question affecting the welfare and perpetuity of our Republic while they have no voice at all, not even in a "debating society." But some say this league has no authority to settle questions. It must be done by the council; that it is a mere "debating society"; that Great Britain gets no real benefit, but the mere satisfaction of having a few more representatives to put in their word whenever a question is debated. What folly! We have not a gambler's chance in this league. The cards are stacked against us. No sportsman would consider for a moment such a proposition. Can you conceive of Sir Thomas Lipton, the great English sportsman, challenging America to a yacht race, and after the contract had been entered into and the terms specifically stated announcing that as a consideration he would make a few mild reservations, and that among others he would understand that he was to have six men on his boat to every one that was on the American yacht, but that his men were not to touch a rope nor furl a sail, but simply to "stand around" and have nothing to do except to "say their say" in the event of any debate? Do you think American sportsmen would accept this "reservation" without question? This six-to-one proposition has been discussed so often in this Senate, and the Senate been given to understand that no advantage was to be had—that one equaled six, and so forth, a new mathematical philosophy that I do not understand—that I shall not undertake to discuss it. If six is no better than one, why did Premier Lloyd-George for hours and days insist that his dominions and colonies should each have a vote?

The very fact that Great Britain insisted upon this provision is sufficient evidence to prove to me that she expected some advantage to accrue to her from this unfair basis of representation; and having raised my hand to Heaven and sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, I swear by the Eternal that I never will submit to, and never will vote to ratify, a contract whereby my Government does not have equal power with that of any other government on this earth.

Other men may satisfy their conscience in permitting our Government to have a lesser representation in the councils of the world than Great Britain, but as for me nothing will satisfy my sense of patriotism but to give my Government at least an equal representation with that of any other. I place my Government and my flag above that of any other colony, government, or kingdom on the face of the earth, and on that issue I am willing to stand.

One word more on our representation in the league, and I am through with that feature of the question: In the dark days of the world conflict, when England was calling to America, and entreating her aid, she raised no question as to the numbers we should furnish in her defense. At that time she asked not that one American should equal six Britons, but her cry and supplication was for more munitions, more money, more ships, more food, and more men! And how America responded: She opened her treasures, she loaded ships with provisions, every farmer in the land rose to the occasion, and every available foot of soil in our whole country was cultivated and planted to supply the ever-increasing demand of the Allies. And our splendid boys paused not to reason why, but responded to the call of their country with a courage and heroism which has never been surpassed, crossing 3,000 miles of billows to meet the Teutons on foreign fields, and to raise the banner of the Republic across the seas, where it shall ever be honored by the nations of the world.

Ah no; there was then no suggestion that one equaled six, but we were given opportunity to furnish in that exigency our full quota.

Before proceeding to discuss the most menacing provision of the treaty I wish to mention a condition which may arise at any time. Suppose the bandits of Mexico should come across the border into the State of Texas, as they have done many times, confiscating property, murdering American citizens, and committing all the depredations of which the most miserable and lawless bandits could conceive. Do you think it likely that the Government of the United States would wait until the matter could be brought to the attention of the league of nations, acted upon by the council, and all of the many and varied constitutional questions settled before it would move in the matter? Such a thing is inconceivable. The United States Government, without a moment's delay, would send its armies to the rescue of the citizens of Texas; immediate activities of war would begin, as they should, and this entirely contrary to the provisions of the treaty. This is not a theoretical proposition, but a condition that may develop at any time, as it has many times in the past.

There are so many potential dangers embraced in this document that the more I study and contemplate it the more convinced I become of its menace to our Government. But some have said that unless it was adopted it would break the heart of the world. I can not subscribe to this sentiment. But, if true, I would rather "break the heart of the world" and save and preserve my own country than to shatter the heart, soul, and hope of America in attempting to stimulate the heartbeats of the world.

The labor question is by far the most vital one before the country. Since Part XIII of the peace treaty is presumably in the interest of labor, not much careful scrutiny has been given it until recently, when it was so well explained by the able and eloquent senior Senators from Wisconsin and Colorado [Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. THOMAS].

To my mind, however, that section contains possibilities of harm to American labor and infinite danger to American industry. I believe we should give the most deliberate consideration to the subject before we decide that the United States can progress through political alliance with the socialistic movements of all Europe.

Roughly, and very briefly put, the provisions of Part XIII of the treaty establish a permanent organization of labor, recognized by the peace commission, international in membership, members to be chosen from the nations in the league, the organization to consist of a general conference and an international labor office. The general conference of representatives are to meet yearly—often if necessary—four representatives from each nation appointed by the Government—one appointed by the Government to represent the Government; one appointed by the Government but nominated by employers to represent them; and one appointed by the Government to be nominated by the workpeople to represent them.

Please bear in mind, therefore, that the probable size of such conference would be more than 100 delegates. Since all 27 signatory nations, all 13 States invited to become such, and 6 States that later may be invited—a total of 46—will furnish these delegates. The international labor office controlled by 24 persons, 12 representing the conference, 6 representing employers, 6 representing the workers; 8 of the 12 representing the Governments to be nominated by nations which are of chief industrial importance. This governing body will elect its own chairman, regulate its own procedure, fix its own times of meeting, appoint its own director. The director will appoint his own staff to carry out the functions of the international labor office, which include the collection and distribution of information on all subjects relating to the international adjustment of conditions in industrial life and labor. Also the editing and publishing in French and in English and in other languages, if the governing body thinks desirable, of a periodical paper dealing with the problems of industry and employment of international interest.

This gives a general idea of the scope and character of the organization, and when we see the possibilities of such an organization—as affecting our own country, bearing in mind the conditions existing with us at the present moment, and the tendency in the future, not conditions existing in the European countries and the tendency of their national labor movements—we can judge of its injury to American labor. As all know, the trend is strong in Europe toward the nationalization of all private capital and industry—toward socialism, and almost Bolshevism. In those countries already the wageworkers want to rule more and more, and year by year the recommendations and proclamations of their trade-unions are strongly socialistic.

As proof of this let me cite the fact that last July, when delegates met at Amsterdam to reorganize the International Trade Union Congress, after the congress had been adjourned, the delegates, with the exception of the United States, reassembled into a socialistic conference. As I said before, the American labor movement was not represented, and here in the United States we feel that the labor-capital problem can be solved. Although there are differences between manual wage earners and the capitalists, yet these differences we feel can be reconciled. But the difference between capitalism and socialism, particularly that extreme form of socialism called Bolshevism, can not be reconciled, and the question for us to raise is whether this proposed labor organization called the International Labor Conference will actually bring labor and industrial management in this country into closer sympathy and understanding, or will it simply promote the doctrine and the cause of socialism, even Bolshevism?

In the light of the fact that an international trade-union congress openly declared itself for a socialistic congress, it would seem to me that it were well for us to consider this matter most attentively.

For we in the United States are not yet ready to say that the final decision in all questions of labor law and labor protection belongs to the workers themselves. The social currents in our country are not yet wholly prosocialistic nor wholly anticapitalistic. This is not true in the European countries. Even conservative England's tendencies are strongly prosocialistic, and surely the workers of our country are not prepared to be bound by laws imposed on them by representatives of other countries whose ideals are contrary to our ideals. As an example: England has declared for the nationalization of its coal mines. This international labor conference could arrange for a discussion of the subject, and upon approval of the principle by two-thirds of the delegates voting, our Government, and each of the other Governments represented in the league, would be forced to place the matter before the Congress, and the full force of all the machinery of the international labor office, with its opportunity for world-wide publication, could be utilized for adopting the proposition, and these matters are important alike to capitalists and workers.

Another way in which the treaty provisions can operate against us is found in article 407, which provides that independent alliances may be formed between the various groups of labor and employers—and these may easily be in competition with America in foreign trade. And I see another hazard to our Government in the wonderful opportunity for the dissemination all over the face of the globe of the doctrine of socialism.

If you will recall my words regarding the functions of this international labor office, you will readily see what a splendid chance is afforded for spreading the gospel of socialism through this channel, and America will be forced to go Europe's way rather than to go her own way, which has heretofore proved so successful. For with an overpowering voting strength against her the United States delegates would be unable to lead and direct the European delegates, and would in turn have to be led and directed the European way; and I contend, and shall continue to contend, that we can do more for Europe by remaining independent and acting independently in these matters and proving to the world by our own success the worth and strength of our stand. For surely no close national understanding can ever be created between American labor and American capital if yearly the subject is to be opened up and action taken by influences that are un-American and contrary to the American ideals.

American workmen are to-day receiving higher wages and living under better conditions than any other class of laborers in the world, and in many countries which would be represented in this international congress the wages paid manual labor are less than one-tenth that paid the wageworker in this country.

I can not permit this provision to be passed without protesting against such unfair competition as would surely come to the American workmen, and whatever consideration may be given this I believe that if the laborers of our country knew and understood well its provisions they would unanimously favor its removal from the covenant.

Some have said that my policy is not constructive, and that I have nothing to offer in place of the covenant. I have this suggestion to make, which I believe worthy of consideration—that instead of a document embracing 535 pages and 80,000 words I believe in a resolution declaring that we are at peace with Germany, not even stating that the war is over, simply declaring that we are at peace, and that the treaty which had been in effect since 1787 and which governed our Nation

prior to the declaration of war is again our controlling covenant. This would be a business man's proposition. There would be no involved meanings, no complex phrases; the language would be plain and unmistakable. The humblest citizen of the land would know precisely what was meant. Under that treaty for 130 years no criticism was uttered. It proved satisfactory to both Governments. No time of the Senate need be spent in discussing its provisions, but it could be accepted and approved and it would effectively clear our skirts of all alliances with the Governments overseas.

I realize that in these trying days of readjustment and restlessness there is a feeling of fear lest civilization fall us, our Government deteriorate, and our cherished institutions be shattered. I share no such fear or foreboding. This is not the first crisis in our country's history. In 1865 I recall that men trembled with fear lest the Union be severed, and the old temple of liberty was shaken to its very foundation. Was that fear warranted? No. The great middle classes, the men from the farms and the homes, patriotic and loyal citizens who believed in the Union and in right, joined hands and forces. They came from all parties and creeds. They chose a leader who was born on a farm, who could build a log cabin and fence his acres with rails, and who later built the citadel of individual, universal, and unconditional freedom and fenced it with the strong arm of constitutional law. And history repeats itself. To-day the farmers of this country are interesting themselves in the vital questions which confront us, are forming their opinions, and seeking their leader. And I have an abiding faith that in the solution of this problem—perhaps the greatest that was ever presented to a people—the Members of this Senate, representing the highest, finest type of citizenship, will preserve the principles which have been bequeathed to us by former generations and will give to posterity not a mongrel flag of international character and a Nation weakened by its alliance with other governments of the earth, but a Nation whose beneficent charity shall be the hope of the poor and oppressed of every land; a Nation whose example shall be the guiding star shedding the light of truth, righteousness, and eternal justice; a Nation complete in its own majesty and greatness, with one purpose, one Government, one flag!

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Henderson	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Moses	Smoot
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	New	Spencer
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newberry	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Keyes	Pittman	Warren
Fernald	Kirby	Poinexter	Watson
Fletcher	Knox	Pomerene	Williams
France	La Follette	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gay	Lodge	Sheppard	
Hale	McCormick	Sherman	
Harding	McCumber	Simmons	

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are detained from the Senate by illness. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness in his family. The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are detained on public business. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has gone to Massachusetts to vote in the State elections.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

[Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Senate in continuation of the speech begun by him on Friday last. After having spoken for over an hour he yielded the floor for the day.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors.

The motion was agreed to, and the doors were closed. After 10 minutes spent in executive session with closed doors, the doors were reopened.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, November 4, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 3, 1919.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Norman H. Davis, of Tullahoma, Tenn., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Dr. Leo S. Rowe, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, November 3, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of life, with its hopes and precious promises, we stand before Thee in awe and reverence, in the presence of death; so inscrutable, wrapt in profound mystery, we could not stand the shock but for our faith and confidence in Thy love, the essence of Thy being.

When a child is born into the family, there is joy and all the affections of the heart are centered upon it. But when death enters the house, there is grief, profound sorrow and lamentations; hence our hearts go out in deepest sympathy to the parents, grand-parents, and kinsfolk, in the going of the little Champ Clark Thompson.

Especially do we sympathize with his distinguished Grandfather, who has been closely identified with this House for more than a quarter of a century—a Speaker, who served it for eight years and endeared himself to this Representative Body, in his wisdom and fair dealing with all.

Comfort him and all who are mourning the loss of the dear one, upon whom love was centered, with the hope that sometime, somewhere, they shall meet him to love and cherish forever. In the name of Him who died on Calvary, the earnest of the immortality of the soul; and glory, and honor, and praise be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, November 1, 1919, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Wednesday. I make that request, Mr. Speaker, by reason of the fact that many Members are away attending elections in various States.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent, pending that, that I may address the House for 35 minutes as soon as this is passed.

Mr. MONDELL. Thirty-five minutes, when?

Mr. ASWELL. Now, when the gentleman is through.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be compelled to object to that, Mr. Speaker, because that will break into the important public business of the day. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman should make my request, made on behalf of the whole House, dependent on a personal request. I am not making this request on my own account. I shall be here just as long as Congress is in session. I will be in town, anyway.

Mr. ASWELL. I reserved the right to object.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the request I do on behalf of many gentlemen who feel they must be home election day.

Mr. ASWELL. I reserved the right to object. I do not intend to object. I wish, if I may, to speak for 35 minutes after this.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall have to object to that, for the reason that there is important business before the House under a special rule, and it is not fair under those circumstances to allow 35 minutes of political debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn until Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Wyoming if there is any arrangement being made to have a unanimous-consent day? There are a number of bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL. The very first day possible will be set aside for consideration of the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why could we not take that up to-morrow, and, if there is objection then, the gentleman from Wyoming can move to adjourn? My understanding is that the only purpose in not meeting to-morrow is on account of the many Members who are absent. If any question of quorum is raised to-morrow about unanimous-consent business, then he can move to adjourn.

Mr. MONDELL. It is hardly fair for gentlemen who are away, and who must be away on very important matters, to have a question of quorum raised under those circumstances. I am always here. I am never away when Congress is in session. I never make these requests on my own account, but it is fair to many Members of the House who are to be absent for reasons they deem good that under the circumstances we should stand in recess.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The same objection, if you have the Unanimous Consent Calendar up to-morrow, would occur if you went on to other business. A lot of these men who are away and many others would like to be here on unanimous-consent day. If you raise the question of no quorum, we would then be in the same position as we are in to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WELTY] was suddenly called away, and I ask unanimous consent that he be granted leave of absence for one week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WELTY] be granted leave of absence for one week. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, as to-morrow will mark the anniversary of the signing of the armistice between Italy and Austria, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the achievements of the Italian Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the achievements of the Italian Army. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I regret to do so, but I think in order to let the privileges of the Record be the same to all Members and let the Record represent just what happens here on the floor, I shall be, during the rest of the session, obliged to object to any extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a set of resolutions passed by the American Legion of the State of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record a set of resolutions passed by the American Legion of that State. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I do so reluctantly, but I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. When?

Mr. BURKE. Now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I must be fair in this matter of objecting to extension of remarks of that length. I objected a moment ago to the gentleman from Louisiana, and it would not be fair for me now to allow the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

A QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of no quorum. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point that there is no quorum present. It is clear that no quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Fields	Klecza	Reber
Andrews, Md.	Flood	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.
Anthony	Fordney	LaGuardia	Riddick
Ashbrook	Frear	Langley	Riordan
Bakka	Fuller, Ill.	Leibach	Robison, Ky.
Bacharach	Fuller, Mass.	Leshner	Rodenberg
Barkley	Gallivan	Little	Rogers
Bell	Gandy	Longworth	Rouse
Boies	Ganly	Luce	Rowan
Booher	Garland	Lufkin	Rowe
Bowers	Garner	McClintic	Rubey
Britten	Garrett	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Brooks, Pa.	Godwin, N. C.	McDuffie	Sanford
Browning	Goldfogle	McGlennan	Saunders, Va.
Brumbaugh	Good	McKenzie	Schall
Butler	Goodall	McKeown	Scully
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McKinstry	Sherwood
Campbell, Kans.	Gould	McLane	Shreve
Candler	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Siegel
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	MacCrate	Sinclair
Carew	Green, Iowa	Madden	Sisson
Carter	Greene, Mass.	Magee	Slomp
Casey	Greene, Vt.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Mo.	Griest	Mann, Ill.	Snell
Cleary	Griffin	Mason	Snyder
Cole	Hamill	Mead	Steele
Cooper	Hardy, Tex.	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Costello	Harrison	Minahan, N. J.	Strong, Pa.
Crago	Haskell	Montague	Sullivan
Crowther	Hawley	Mooney	Swope
Cullen	Heflin	Moore, Ohio	Tague
Dallinger	Hicks	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ark.
Darrow	Hill	Moore, Va.	Thomas
Davey	Holland	Moore, Ind.	Tincher
Davis, Minn.	Houghton	Morin	Tinkham
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Treadway
Dent	Humphreys	Neely	Upshaw
Dewalt	Husted	Nicholls, S. C.	Vare
Donovan	Hutchinson	O'Connell	Venable
Doelling	Ireland	O'Connor	Voigt
Doremus	Jefferis	Ogden	Walsh
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Olney	Walters
Drane	Johnson, S. Dak.	Paige	Ward
Dunn	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Wason
Eagan	Johnston, N. Y.	Pell	Watson, Pa.
Eagle	Jones, Pa.	Peters	Webb
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan	Welty
Elston	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	Wilson, Pa.
Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	Radcliffe	Wise
Evans, Nebr.	Kettner	Rainey, H. T.	Woodyard
Ferris	Kless	Rainey, J. W.	Zihlman
Fess	Kincheloe	Ramsey	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 225 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill referred to.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, can the Chair entertain a request for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would be glad to do so, but does not think he has the right to after the House has voted to go into Committee of the Whole.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of S. 2472, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to find out something about the control of the time. My understanding Saturday was that the ranking Democratic member of the committee should have yielded to him a certain amount of time to be controlled by him. My understanding was that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. KING] was to yield 30 minutes to this side, to be controlled by the ranking Democratic member of the committee, but I do not know what the understanding was with reference to the yielding of time by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT]. I should like to have some understanding about that, so that we can allot the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Arkansas that for the purpose of expediting the business of the House the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] for one hour and a half and will also recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] for one hour and a half, with the understanding that each gentleman is to yield half an hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN], who will control one hour.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, the gentleman from Massachusetts will control one hour, of which one-half hour is to be from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] and one-half hour from the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT]?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. In the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN], I should like to have an understanding that I am to control that hour, so that I may know how to meet the requests that I have. I do not care for any time myself, but I should like to have it understood that I can yield that hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York will be willing to do that.

Mr. WINGO. If it is understood that I shall have one hour to control, one half from the gentleman from New York and the other half from the gentleman from Illinois, then I can arrange to meet the requests that I have.

Mr. PLATT. I am agreeable to that proposition, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WINGO. All right.

Mr. PLATT. I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas 30 minutes—not immediately.

Mr. WINGO. I understand that. Here is the idea: Let me control one hour, one half of which is to come from the gentleman from New York and the other half from the gentleman from Illinois. In other words, each one of us three will control one hour of the general debate.

Mr. PLATT. I think that is fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to recognize that arrangement.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my purpose to speak on this bill, important though it is; but I do want to bring to the attention of the House another matter that seems to me of first importance. I have in my hand a telegram—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Under the rule under which this measure is being considered it was provided that all debate should be limited to the subject in the bill, and I must object to any extraneous debate under that rule, and I raise the point of order that the gentleman admits that he does not intend to talk on the bill.

Mr. REAVIS. My understanding of the rule is that debate is not necessarily confined to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Chair will inspect the record of the adoption of the rule, he will find that all debate was to be limited to the subject matter of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule contains no such provision.

Mr. BLANTON. But the agreement was in connection with the adoption of the rule. If the Chair will inspect the record, I am sure he will find it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I insist that when we adopt an agreement it should be kept.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a telegram—

Mr. BLANTON. I insist on my point of order.

Mr. REAVIS. This is not to be taken from my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does not the rule contain the agreement adopted by the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas claims that by unanimous consent it was also agreed in the House that debate should be limited to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not delay the gentleman while I find it. I will be able to cite it to the Chair later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, again let me state that I have in my hand a telegram from the editor of one of the most influ-

ential small daily newspapers of my State, which is quite characteristic of several similar communications recently received by me, and which I would like to read. The telegram follows:

NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR., October 31.

HON. C. F. REAVIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Small newspapers face possibility of suspension due to inability to get news-print paper. Large papers continue to waste paper with extra editions, which are unnecessary. Is it not possible to get immediate action through some governmental authority to ration print paper and prevent catastrophe coming to publishers of country papers, which are bulwark of this country? Our own supply to-day is barely sufficient for three days, and mills refuse to furnish print paper bought in good faith months ago.

J. H. SWEET.

After receiving this, and with the desire to be of assistance in the premises, I tried to locate some department or bureau which has authority to act. My experience was the one so common to all of us, of being passed and shunted from pillar to post, only to give it up as hopeless in the end.

The demand for print paper has increased 34 per cent this year over that of any previous year, an increase so great as to challenge inquiry on the part of those interested. The reason for the increase has been universally ascribed to the tremendous increase of what is called "national advertising."

I have information of the most reliable character as to this national advertising business and the causes which have so tremendously nurtured it. We have an excess-profits tax, one of the most profitable sources of revenue in the revenue laws. It is a graduated tax that increases proportionately as the excess profit increases. An institution showing profit of a certain sum must pay, let us say, a tax of 10 per cent; if the profit is over the specified sum, the tax is 12 per cent; and so on up as the profits increase in amount. If the profits are but slightly above the 12 per cent sum, a little judicious expenditure will bring it below that sum and save the institution thousands of dollars. From such motive and inspired by such purpose comes a large amount of the vastly increased national advertising. Not a Member who listens to me but has noted the unprecedented amount of advertising the magazines and great metropolitan dailies of the East are now carrying. Nothing like it has ever been known before. I have information of unquestioned reliability, coming from a source of assured truthfulness and opportunity for knowledge, that millions of dollars are now being expended in national advertising for the purpose of reducing the excess-profits tax which would otherwise go into the Treasury.

What is the result? Just this: The Government is losing money to which it is entitled, and the print-paper supply is being used to such an extent that the country press is facing destruction.

The department should at once investigate this matter. Nothing is in the way of compelling these enterprising gentlemen who are escaping taxation from disgorging.

I have no quarrel with a newspaper's prosperity; rather do I rejoice in it. I am in accord with the general view as to the usefulness of advertising, but I do object to the method adopted and the purpose sought to be served.

More than this, I object to the hardship inflicted on the country press. It is the bulwark of the country and one of the great stabilizing influences of the Nation. It has no ties or alliances that ever betray it away from the general good, and never does it become the representative of special interest. It reaches homes that are strangers to the great dailies, and it exercises at all times an influence as salutary as it is widespread.

Congress can not meet this question in time to be of service, but I feel impelled to call the situation to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee with the hope that some of its members will take this up with the Internal Revenue Department and have them look into the amount of advertising these gentlemen are claiming in their tax returns—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman proceeding if he wants to, but I do object to the extension of any further remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to complete the sentence which was left suspended in the air when the gavel stopped me.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I think the RECORD should be uniform and all Members used alike. I re-

luctantly must object to the gentleman's completing the sentence.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not the morning's RECORD does not contain an extension of his own remarks?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; because the House authorized it.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, on account of having considerable material which I would like to present for the consideration of the House concerning this bill, I am going to ask the indulgence of the House that I be not interrupted during the presentation of it. I also ask at this time unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, reluctantly I must object, because I think the privilege of the RECORD should be uniform to all Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects, and the gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill without a name. It has a number, to wit, Senate 2472. But while it has no name and bears an indifferent number, it has a purpose—a tremendous purpose. Its importance entitles it to a consideration equal to that given the league of nations, for it proposes not merely to cement the nations of the earth by political bonds but to shackle them with the fetters of trade and to grapple them together with the hooks of greed.

The vital part of the bill is found in the very beginning, wherein, without further resort to the Congress, it furnishes authorization enabling any number of natural persons, not less than five, to form themselves into corporations for the purpose of—

First. Engaging principally in international or foreign banking;

Second. Engaging in other international or foreign financial operations;

Third. Engaging in banking or other financial operations in a dependency or insular possession of the United States;

Fourth. Engaging in any of the foregoing enterprises directly or through the agency, ownership, or control of local institutions in foreign countries, or in such dependency or insular possessions;

Fifth. To act, when required, as fiscal agents of the United States; and

Sixth. To engage in other ventures not inconsistent with law.

These vital parts are left undisturbed by the rest of the bill, which consists of straggling and grotesque appendages in legislative courtesy called safeguards, which furnish no protection to the general public, but rather act as lubricants for the better working of these contemplated money-getting contrivances.

The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hairy hand of Esau.

BUREAUCRATIC LEGISLATION.

This bill presents a fine specimen of bureaucratic legislation. If the Congress ever intends, as it surely does, to regain the powers granted it by the fathers, of which it is now temporarily deprived by bureaucratic encroachment, now is the time to start upon such a campaign by defeating by a decisive majority the bill now offered for your consideration.

The right of petition is rarely addressed by the people to Congress nowadays, but rather to the bureaus. No longer do we hear about the powerful congressional lobbies in Washington. Why? Because lobbying is dead? No! The lobbyists live and in their invisible habiliments and at proper intervals swoop down upon the Capitol as of yore, but instead of lobbying Congress they lobby the bureaus. Let a powerful bureau once take up a cause to be lobbied, then the legislative marauders can return to their usual haunts well satisfied that the bureau will put the legislation through Congress.

The practice of bureaucrats edging themselves into committee rooms to render their smug opinions and deliver their hearsay evidence in the capacity of lobbyists is, if I mistake not, in the growing opinion of the Members of this House, riding to a fall.

Bureaucracy is un-American. The conditions to-day in Russia are largely due to the evils of bureaucratic control under the Czar.

Government bureaus, especially those located in Washington, are far removed from the people, who do not understand the method of approach. Most of them do not have the money or the means to present their case to the bureau. Those who advocate from day to day and degree by degree the passage of laws creating autocracy by the establishment of bureaus may rejoice that the ordinary man is prevented from easy access to his Government; but such a condition, if allowed to continue, means

eventual distrust and disaster. To-day in this country the common people are nearer in touch with the Government through their Members of Congress, elected directly by them, than through any other avenue. Every time you weaken Congress by the establishment of a bureau in which the authority of Congress is lessened, you lay one more stone in the erection of the temple of autocracy. Remove the Congress and autocracy is complete. These bureaus are not only legislating by administrative processes but are usurping the power and prerogatives of the people's courts. There are more decisions rendered, and even then without due process of law, affecting the lives, liberty, and property of the people of this country in the bureaus than there are in the courts of the land. When once an opinion is given by a bureau, it is regarded by such bureau, and especially by the person who wrote it, as not only the soundest but also the supreme law of the land. To-day between the black-cloth books on the shelf in the inaccessible back office of the modern bureaucrat is impounded the greater part of the rules of action for the people, which formerly were found between the covers of sheep-bound books in any lawyer's library, or in any judge's chamber, throughout the country.

A celebrated gentleman at the other end of the Capitol the other day said, "Every time we get a recommendation from the Federal Reserve Board it is for expansion." In this very bill before us this board is delegated power in 26 different and distinct items.

This bill furnishes an admirable example of lobbying legislation and expansion by executive process. It is not an opinion to be indulged in that bureaus originate ideas because they are the first to present plans to us, nor in the case of this bill, although written by the attorney for the Federal Reserve Board, is it to be presumed that either he or the board originated the ideas and purposes of the bill. Far from it.

LEGISLATION FOR PLUTUS.

Plutus is the greatest and most successful lobbyist the world has ever known. He insists on monopolizing more than two-thirds of the time used in congressional action with his wants. He generally appears before our committees by bureaucratic proxy. He has never admitted that he desires to make money through legislative enactment; oh, no; he has brains. He is always unselfishly concerned with the public interest. If he desires to increase the flow of oil into his tanks he seeks legislation merely to conserve its supply for the benefit of the people. If he contemplates apprehending a water-power site he does so because he is so horrified to think that the water is running to waste. He is concerned because the farmer needs fertilizer (at his figures). He would conserve all resources (for himself). The water-power site, if he is permitted to seize it, will, of course, be a burden to him, but will incidentally furnish nitrogen for those who need it and pulp and paper for the newspapers. In fact, as developed by the arguments of his bureaucratic propaganda, if he is permitted to lay his hands on the resources of the country everything worthy will be accomplished, but he will make no money.

Should Plutus be interested in and behind such legislation at a time when the people of the country are pressed and gouged by the profiteers and in dire distress, he then argues that his scheme will reduce the high cost of living, and if his scouting for favors is in time of war it will be highly patriotic to accede to his wishes.

THE CONCEPTACLE OF MONEY-MAKING LEGISLATION.

It may be impossible to mark the exact spot where exists the conceptacle of money-gathering legislation. There is, however, such a concatenation of ideas, desires, and ambitions among the disciples of Plutus causing such a friendliness and community of interest feeling as to be quite marvelous. Their morale in action is wonderful. No bureau, board, or commission of the Government has been known to withhold against them. The smile of Plutus, backed by the pamphleteers and the press, will bend the stiffest back of a bureaucrat into a bow such as the Russian peasant was wont to use when he addressed his landlord as "Your nobility."

The case before us is not an exception to the rule. I do not charge corruption. The members of the Federal Reserve Board are honest men. They are all honorable men. I do say, however, that they are not the originators of this legislation, but that the same was pointed out to them not by the farmers, not by the mechanics, and not by the great masses of the country, who carry upon their backs the mistakes of the Nation, but by those who toil not, nor spin, and whose habitat is in the vicinity of old Trinity Church, in the city of New York. This bill sprang from the loins of the money kings. Its first introduction into society was at the Fifth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at Cincinnati in April, 1918, and held under the auspices of the National Foreign Trade Council, India House, Hanover

Square, New York City, at which convention it was resolved that "the bill providing Federal charters for banks engaged in foreign trade should be enacted into law." At the same time there was great rejoicing in the convention over the fact that Congress had just passed the Webb bill, companion piece of this bill, the two of which may well be called, for reasons following, the "Twin sisters of darkness."

THE TWIN SISTERS OF DARKNESS.

Let us examine briefly, first, the provisions of the Webb law; secondly, the provisions of the bill under consideration; and thirdly, the effect of the propositions involved in both, in operation at the same time.

The Webb law is more particularly described as "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 19, 1918. (Public, No. 126, 65th Cong.)

This law provides that associations "entered into for the sole purpose of engaging in export trade, and actually engaging solely in such export trade, or an agreement made or act done in the course of such export trade by such association"—not in restraint of trade in the United States—are exempted and freed from the operation, pains, and penalties of the United States statute known as the Sherman antitrust law, more definitely referred to as "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890.

The Webb Act therefore renders legal that which before its passage was illegal, to wit, contracts, combinations, and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce, the creating and fostering of monopolies, interlocking and dummy directorates, rebating, price fixing, forestalling, pooling, traffic associations, blackmailing, and boycotting.

In addition to the exemptions granted to these associations and agreements made under the Webb law they are exempted from the operation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, being "An act to supplement existing laws against restraints and monopolies and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (Public, No. 212, 63d Cong.), thereby rendering legal that which before the passage of the Webb law was illegal, to wit, the acquisition or ownership by any corporation of the whole or any part of the stock or other capital of any corporation organized solely for the purpose of engaging in export trade and actually engaged solely in such export trade, unless the effect of such acquisition of ownership may be to restrain trade or substantially lessen competition in the United States.

As to the bill before us, it is a very serious and at least a debatable question whether or not the associations or so-called banks to be organized under it are not included in the exemptions from the Sherman Antitrust Act, or at least could be so organized as to be included in the exemption under that act in the same manner and to the same extent as are the Webb corporations. For it will be noted that organizations formed under this bill are required only to be engaged principally in foreign financial operations; that is, they are to be chiefly or mainly so engaged. They may therefore be engaged in foreign financial operations 51 per cent and in the exportation of goods or some other business 49 per cent. A Webb concern is a mere unincorporated association, which can operate under and in conjunction with and as an integral department of a corporation organized under this bill. In fact, it is authorized to pursue various objects not inconsistent with law. An agreement between the financial department and the export department would be nothing more than "an agreement made or act done in the course of export trade" (see Webb law), and if so it is exempted from the operation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, as I believe it was intended should be done when the Webb bill was prepared for Congress in April, 1918. They, too, will then be permitted to indulge in all the legerdemain prohibited by the Sherman Antitrust Act and permitted by the Webb law except as to interlocking directorates, which are regulated by section 8 of the Clayton Act with two liberalizing amendments put to the bill by the House Committee on Banking and Currency and found on page 11 of the bill, lines 1 to 14, inclusive, which, however, allows a director of a member bank of a Federal reserve bank which owns stock in one of these contraptions to be a director in the same, and permits a director in another concern if his association owns stock in another similar company.

But even if the Edge company is not so exempted from the operation of the Sherman antitrust law it can nevertheless so associate itself with a Webb corporation or corporations in foreign financial operations as to exempt it from its provisions, and this without the violation of any law. The right hand will know not what the left hand does. The intertwining of the various elements of organizations under the Webb law and those contemplated by this bill can not be prevented.

There is nothing to stop the gradual absorption of all Webb corporations and Edge corporations into one great whole—the greatest and most powerful trust the world has ever seen.

A corporation organized under the Webb Act can (1) purchase and hold any number of shares of stock in any one or more corporations proposed under this act; (2) any one or more of the stockholders in a Webb corporation can purchase and hold one or any number of shares of stock in corporations proposed by this act; (3) purchase and hold the bonds and debentures in Edge corporations; (4) purchase and hold stock in all other export or Webb companies.

A corporation organized under this bill can:

(1) Purchase and hold stock in Webb corporations (but not in other corporations organized under this bill or in corporations doing a similar business organized under State laws if the same are in substantial competition with the purchasing corporation). The Webb corporations are not in substantial competition with the corporations organized under this act and therefore Edge corporations or their stockholders can purchase one or any number of shares in a Webb corporation. In fact the stocks of both classes of corporations are interchangeable.

(2) The Edge corporations organized hereunder may receive deposits from any or all of the export corporations organized under the Webb law.

An association under the Webb law may be initiated, organized, and put into successful operation, according to a speech made by Mr. George H. Charles, of the American Rolling Mills, before the Fifth National Foreign Trade Convention, by carrying out the following suggestions:

If it is proposed to organize a district export selling company under the Webb law the first thing to be done is to call a meeting of 5 or 10 leading exporters of the district in which it is proposed to operate. These exporters can meet informally and discuss the general outlines of organization and operation. The geographical extent of the district will naturally vary with the requirements of the district. Each district should have a central or hub city. A district in southern Ohio probably would have Cincinnati as a central city and take in, geographically, territory having due reference to the railways which might be inclosed conveniently in that district.

With the regular organization completed, a good business man should be secured and a close study begun of foreign trade. The lists of foreign houses in the hands of all the members should be compiled and sent to the central office for the benefit of all the members. Weekly or monthly meetings should be held for the benefit of all members in the district, and representatives to travel in foreign countries employed. The manufacturers in the district should deal only with the district manager.

The business of all manufacturers in one district who do business in one country—i. e., Brazil—should be merged. Warehouses in foreign countries and also the hub city should be rented or erected. An extension of credit is necessary to compete with foreign buyers.

After the organization of one section into a district export-selling company similar companies can be organized in other geographical districts, which would all join together. It is necessary to set aside a large fund for advertising the export products of the districts.

The advantages of this sort of a combination are unlimited. A foreign sales organization is effected and a list of foreign buyers, their needs and requirements obtained. American stocks can be carried in foreign and American warehouses, and the manufacturers do not compete with each other in foreign markets.

These district companies form a nucleus for larger and more pretentious selling companies.

If these Webb corporations are in need of and expect the financial aid of the corporations organized under this act, a fact which is not admitted, because there is sufficient law to take care of them already, then their interests are vital to and dependent upon one another and their close financial intimacy in the business of making money for themselves will soon cause them, as it did the railroads, the oil companies, the sugar companies, and other companies engaged in domestic commerce in the days prior to the passage of the Sherman antitrust law, to seek closer comradeship, which is permitted to them when we pass this act, although such close association may be as injurious to the interest of the people now as it was then.

A glance at that period is given us by Senator John Sherman in the Senate March 24, 1890 (p. 2560, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD):

Senator SHERMAN. * * * The railroads were then too powerful to be dealt with. They combined together. There was one striking case, which I introduced in my argument the other day, where they gave a single other corporation in the combine the advantage of \$5,400,000 a year in one transportation contract.

Senator GEORGE. What other corporation now, besides the Standard Oil Co., located at Cleveland, Ohio, is in the Standard Oil combination?

Senator SHERMAN. I am not prepared to say; but an examination was made into this matter by a committee of the other House, of which Mr. Bacon was chairman, and, I think, in the report which was made he gave a list of the corporations, and if I am not mistaken there were 40 or 50, all interlaced with each other, having different interests nominally, different incorporators, different charters. I think there are 40 or 50 great combinations. I do not know the exact number, but perhaps some gentleman who has gone into the reading of that report may be able to answer.

So with the other combinations. I do not wish to single out the Standard Oil Co., which is a great and powerful corporation, composed in great part of citizens of my own State and some of the very best men I know of. Still they are controlling and can control the market as absolutely as they choose to do it; it is a question of their

will. The point for us to consider is whether, on the whole, it is safe in this country to leave the production of property, the transportation of our whole country, to depend upon the will of a few men sitting at their council board in the city of New York, for there the whole machine is operated.

After this stand John Sherman no longer trod the "primrose path" in politics.

The exponent of the American Rolling Mills has pointed out the way district export companies may be formed and put in operation, and it is very easy to see how soon they will spread themselves over the entire Nation. In an endeavor to illustrate the facilities afforded the Webb corporations and the Edge corporations to combine and recombine, and finally coalesce into one great and harmonious whole, let us organize right here nine Webb corporations:

First. The Sunset Foreign Export Association, taking in the Pacific coast.

Second. The Rocky Mountain Co., including the Rocky Mountain region.

Third. The Blue Rapids Exports Co., taking in the State of Kansas and the lesser States surrounding it.

Fourth. The Ozark Exporting Concern, taking in the Ozark regions.

Fifth. The Southern Co. of Foreign Exporters.

Sixth. The Roger Williams Co., taking in Rhode Island and the territory within the zone of its influence.

Seventh. The Ohio River Exporters' Association.

Eighth. The Mississippi Valley Exporting Co.

Ninth. The Massesoit Co. of New England.

Then let us organize three Edge corporations to operate under the terms of this bill:

First. The Unlimited Bank of Nations.

Second. The Immeasurable Banking Institution.

Third. The Greatest Bank on Earth.

Mr. Charles has pointed out already that a selling company for all would be a good thing for all. So in our steps to organize a giant trust we may organize a new Webb association to sell the products, and the stock of all district associations could be put in the selling company as a holding company or as an operating company owning the shares of all district companies in the United States and its Territories and dependents. That of itself would be a fair-sized corporation. A corporation being needed to finance these companies and the selling companies, the same owners of stock in the district and selling company could organize an Edge corporation, as they would have no trouble in raising almost any sum among the district companies. If all the district companies were interested in a certain bank organized under this law now under consideration, they would, of course, control it, and the trust is then cumulated in this bank, which not only has the authority to do a foreign banking business as its principal activity, but is permitted to engage in other businesses, which would include joint enterprises with the combination of Webb associations.

But it is more than likely that the great international bank will be formed by those who control the bulk of the money in this country rather than those who control the bulk of the exports. Such financial interests would dominate the export companies. The combination would probably be the result of a more gradual growth.

Under the fourth power above mentioned as being given under the Webb Act, to wit, the right of any Webb export association to purchase and hold any number of shares in any other like concern, it would not be long before Director Spreckels, of the Sunset Foreign Export Association, would load his grip with proxies and powers of attorney and proceed to Denver, where in conversation with Mr. Tabor, one of the principal stockholders and a director in the Rocky Mountain Co., there would be organized, in the interest of economy, efficiency, and coordination, "for the good of the order," a combination of the two companies, either represented by a new concern or, if a matter of convenience, with interlocking or dummy directors, operated ostensibly as two separate concerns.

In the meantime the same character of negotiations had been taking place between Mr. Otis, representing the Ozark Exporting Concern, and Mr. Birmingham, of the Southern Co., into which arrangement the Mississippi Co., by the influence of Mr. Flood, was admitted in good standing. There also has been effected an organization through the good offices of Mr. Long, of the Ohio River Exporting Co., and Mr. Fitzgerald, of the Massesoit Co., to which has been added the Roger Williams Co. through the kindness of Mr. Aldrich.

Therefore our nine companies, or trusts, as originally organized, are now controlled by three combinations, there being three original companies in each of the new organizations. Interchanging of stock has taken place between them and interlocking dummy directorates established, to the satisfaction of all concerned.

While these combinations have been forming, a Mr. Loeb, one of the influential directors and president of the Unlimited Bank of Nations, of New York, and who has been financing some foreign transactions for the respective associations of Mr. Spreckels, Mr. Tabor, and Mr. Strong, all of them now operating as a whole concern, and from whom he has received huge deposits, is in a very prosperous condition. A closer money-gathering arrangement suddenly arises in Mr. Loeb's mind. Spreckels, Tabor, and Strong come on to New York City. All parties desire a combination with each other. It is found that the Unlimited Bank of Nations has power to purchase and hold stock in the Sunset, Rocky Mountain, and Blue Rapids companies, being mere incorporated associations, provided they are not in substantial competition with his purchasing corporation, his Edge corporation, the Unlimited Bank. They are, of course, not in such competition, and the combination is made, the trust is formed. The example set by Mr. Loeb is soon followed by the organization composed of the Ozark, Southern, and Mississippi Valley combinations, to make a similar arrangement with a certain Edge corporation, which has had their deposits and with which they have been doing business, to wit, the Immeasurable Banking Institution of Mr. Croesus. Thereupon, under like conditions and circumstances, the Ohio, Roger Williams, and Massesoit companies arrange with the greatest bank on earth.

Now, while we increase in strength we decrease in number, and the whole field is represented by three big combinations which are not apparent to the nearsighted eye of the public.

The next thing is a nice little dinner at Banker Loeb's mansion. Foreign Export Merchants Spreckels, Tabor, Strong, Otis, Birmingham, Flood, Long, Fitzgerald, and Aldrich are there. Friend Loeb, the host, and Foreign Bankers Croesus and Rogers, who have grown fat by virtue of the Edge law, grace the occasion. The great constitutional lawyer, statesman, and scholar, Elijah Rutabagar, for a slight consideration, has dropped in, together with those personages of lesser minds but "men who do things" (to the public), the law firm of Hooker, Skinner & Chadbourn, who sit in quiet attention. It is not for me to further describe this dinner, save to say that the statesman, scholar, etc., being called upon, arose, slightly cleared his throat, and spoke briefly, giving a few suggestions, to the great delight of all.

In less than 10 days it was given to the press through the Skinner law office that an organization had been effected which would take over all the stocks of all the aforesaid corporations, combinations, and trusts into one great mother corporation, to be called the Omnipotent Securities Co., at the head of which as president would be placed that great financier and friend of the people generally, J. Rufus Wallingford.

The common people—the farmers, producers, and all manufacturers not on the inside—are astounded. Confusion twice confounded reigns, and they cry aloud, "What can be done?" An echo answers with that old, familiar sound, "How can you unscramble eggs?"

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

The passage of this bill means the destruction of many American industries. If combinations are formed as I have hereinbefore pointed out, it is very easy to see the ruin of American manufacturing concerns who do not or can not enter the combine. No single manufacturer could compete with such a monopoly, and he would be driven to the wall, his business ruined, and his factories fall into decay, just as they did when these great trusts were formed prior to the enactment of the Sherman antitrust law. There is hardly a town in America to-day which can not show you the ruins of some factory which used to help support the town prior to its ruination or purchase and demolition by the trust. Citizens of these villages point mournfully to the deserted and windowless buildings of what used to be a flouring or steel mill or some other active and town-supporting industry before the trust laid upon it the cold hand of death.

If it is a fact, as claimed by the friends of this bill, that these institutions formed under this act will be the means of financing corporations in foreign countries, then we should call a halt before it is too late. Why should the American Congress legislate to tear down industry in the United States and build it up in foreign countries? Yet that this will be attempted as soon as this bill becomes the law, which I trust will not be the case, there is not a shadow of a doubt. That is what this bill is for. There never has been a greater blow struck behind the back of American industry than the attempt to foist this legislation into the statutes. In fact, this ruinous campaign has already started.

Mr. David Lubin, an authority who styles himself delegate to the United States International Institute of Agriculture,

Rome, is a pamphleteer who is more concerned in building up foreign rather than American industry, having in mind, no doubt, the plans of those who secured the passage of the Webb bill, and finally brought this bill to its present status in the House says, in a pamphlet issued by him on November 5, 1918:

It needs no elaborate argument to show the economic advantage of steam and electric power and machinery over hand labor. By far the greater part of the world is still producing its goods by hand labor. We should do all in our power to displace these handmade goods by machine-made goods, but how displace? We have made but little progress by pushing our goods through the means of commercial travelers with their sample trunks.

Mr. Lubin then points out what he calls the line of approach:

Briefly, then, the approach is through the upbuilding of manufacturing centers with their factories in the countries where it would be an economic advantage to replace handmade goods by machine-made goods. Such factories should be under local ownership and direction, which would soon overcome prejudice against change from handmade to machine-made goods.

How could such manufacturing centers with their factories be built up?

Would the local initiative suffice?

No; it would not; the potentialities would be there, but they will have to be awakened, supplemented by American cooperation by Americans. We should make it our business to take a hand in building up such American expert guidance, and right here is our opportunity.

I should say our opportunity to divest ourselves of our manufacturing institutions and transplant them in Europe.

We should make it our business to take a hand in building up such factories and in directing and supervising them until local labor, local direction, and local management becomes sufficiently competent and expert to run them. Under the proposed plan the foreign trade markets of the world would be divided into zones, each with one or more manufacturing centers, each of which will be designated as an industrial and distribution base for the zones. Take, for instance, the Mediterranean Basin as one of these zones. Draw a line from Gibraltar to Syria and let the countries north, south, and east of that line form that zone with Italy as its base. Similar zones could be formed in other parts of the world, as, for instance, in Central America, in South America, and in Russia.

Let each base in a zone be placed on an up-to-date industrial footing; let the factories be provided with the most effective modern machinery. Let each industry be placed on a sound financial basis and, above all, let it be placed under skilled, expert direction. This proposal is now practically working in Italy. It has been under discussion by leading Italians and the Italian ministry. It has met with general favor. A hearing was had with Ambassador Page, who seemed favorably impressed. As a result of the meeting it was decided to go ahead with the plan. It was approved on October 16, 1918, by the Italian minister of commerce, at which meeting leading Italians were present. The plan was approved. It was decided that an effort be made to have Italy become engaged for the commercial and industrial development of the Mediterranean Basin on modern lines and to ask the aid of the American people toward bringing this about. A committee was appointed, with Ernesto Nathan, former mayor of Rome, as chairman. In response to requests for adherents this committee has received favorable replies from bodies representing leading industries, among them the metallurgical, the engineering, the silk, and the cotton-spinning industries. A meeting will shortly be called to effect a permanent organization for the purpose of proceeding on with the work in Italy, when an endeavor will be made to interest the American people in the proposal.

The money-making contingent are rapidly getting in line. They are very forward-looking men. Patriotism disassociated from profits is no shibboleth for them. If more money can be gathered for their individual use, it matters not whether America profits or not. Witness the commencement of the exodus of factories, as indicated in an article published in the *Scientific American*, October 18, 1919:

AMERICAN SILK TROUBLES.

The exodus of Italian workmen returning to Italy has seriously affected the silk industry in the United States, which is handicapped by an increasing shortage of skilled workmen. Thousands are said to have left the manufacturing centers of this country. There have been reports that American manufacturers contemplate the establishment of silk-manufacturing plants in Italy, and several arguments in favor of such a plan have been brought forward. Skilled workers are scarce in this industry, whereas in Italy not only is labor more plentiful but it is believed that it will be possible to attract returned immigrants who have been trained in American mills. Water power may be used in Italy all year round, and the cost of transporting raw material would be saved by locating near the point of production.

The Washington Post of October 29, 1919, says that Arthur J. Belding, vice president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., will move his plant to Germany, and we know that Mr. Henry Ford, another forward-looking man, will construct a factory in Cork. This bill, if it will finance anything, would be a great aid and comfort to the emigration of American industries to foreign soil.

THE PAUPERIZATION OF AMERICAN LABOR.

If this bill were the law, the concerns organized under it would be enabled to finance foreign factories—not only those which might be removed from this country and operated with American capital, but also those which are organized in foreign countries, composed in part or in whole of foreign manufacturers, financed by American money, will spring up almost overnight and flourish like green bay trees. The secret of the popularity of this form of industrial activity, of course, proceeds from the ability of these concerns to operate with cheap foreign labor. They could thereby produce the goods for the for-

eign market much cheaper than could be done in America and increase the profits a thousandfold. The American laborer must then accept an increase in his hours of labor or a great reduction in his pay, or perhaps both, to enable his employer who stays with his industry in America to live.

Mr. Baldwin gave as a reason why he would move his factory to Germany that the workmen there worked 10 hours a day and "at a reasonable wage." The situation which could thus be created is beyond the imagination to contemplate. Not only the workmen but the middle classes would become vagabonds. There is no prospect or possibility of the American laborer, who constitutes a large part of the middle class and maintains a decent standard of living, competing with the Chinese coolie trained to use machinery. Do you think he could compete with the Armenian? This he will have to do if this bill becomes a law. Already our money is blazing the way into Armenia. It will not be long before the Armenian manufacturers, financed under this bill, if passed, and operating with the cheapest sort of labor trained to machinery, will be in the foreign market as our competitors.

THE WEAKENING OF THE HOME MARKET.

It has always been the policy of our Government to maintain at all costs a strong and healthy home market not only for our manufacturers but for our producers. With thousands of factories self-expatriated, fed by American money, and with concerns organized under this bill and the Webb law combined and properly financed, the home market becomes a secondary consideration, especially so if foreign manufacturers are financed with American money. The effect of lowering American wages to meet the competition of foreign pauper labor would so hurt the purchasing power of the average worker that the American market, composed largely of such workers, would be rendered barren as a field for the successful disposition of our wares. The bread line and soup houses would again appear and gaunt misery stalk the land in "the days when the doors shall be shut in the street and the sound of the grinding be low."

In a bulletin issued in 1916 the Federal Trade Commission admits that American factories not members of the combination will be hurt because they can not do business as cheaply as the combination, and states that the combination "is clearly entitled to such business whether it gets it at the expense of some foreign rival or of an American competitor," and admits certain dangers in that the combination might be used to exploit consumers in the home market and that it might be used unfairly against the American concerns in the export trade not members of the organizations. The board at this time evidently did not have presented to it the possible self-expatriation of thousands of American factories, nor the employment of American capital abroad in cooperation with cheap labor to compete with American goods in foreign markets.

The farmer and stock raiser has nothing to gain and everything to lose from the passage of a bill which will facilitate the exploitation of his home market and offers him nothing but the fun of chasing the fantasy of foreign trade, and the stockman will find himself confronted with an organization in form the same as the packers' combine but larger and more effective. In control of the export market, the farmer and stockman will be told from day to day, in the foreign market report in the New York and Chicago exchanges, the prices for which he will sell his produce and live stock in the foreign market. Can any man argue that a huge combination of the kind described and in absolute control of foreign trade will, for a moment, pay to the farmer or stock raiser anything but the lowest price? Is there anyone who thinks that after they have purchased of the farmer that they will not sell their purchase for the highest price obtainable? Is there anyone so foolish as to wager that the consumer will receive any of the difference? No; there will be no reduction in price to the consumer, although what the farmer sells is brought to the lowest possible figures. All is designed to go to the trust. How plain it is, then, that the power and authority given these combinations, financed accordingly, to absolutely fix the price of goods sold on the foreign market, when exercised, must have a tremendous effect on prices of necessities in the United States, and this whether the combinations "conspire" or not. You can try to regulate such effect by penalties, but you can no more control it than King Canute did the tides of the sea, and you can no more regulate this operation than you could modify the laws of gravitation or change the procession of the equinoxes.

THE MAINTENANCE OF THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

It is my belief that a single trust such as can be created in a night out of the Webb corporations and financed the next day under this bill, operating, you might say, "with the lid off," in dealing with foreign exports, without subjecting itself to a prosecution for conspiracy under this act, will by reason of its unlimited control over exports be able to maintain the

present high cost of living and this without the slightest improvement in the condition of the producer. This is illustrated by a cloakroom rumor, the truth of which I will not vouch for, to the effect that a company of forward-looking men had purchased a shipload of shoes from an American manufacturer which usually retail in this country at about \$9 per pair at such a figure that they could be sold abroad for about \$4.98 per pair, the essence of the contract being that none of them should be sold in this country. If enough shoes were dumped on our market, some citizen of these United States could in a slight degree reduce his cost of living by securing the same at a reasonable price. The policy since the war of holding vast stocks in store is to-day maintaining the high cost of living, and when the facilities are made ready vast stores will be exported and withdrawn from the American market. The self-expatriation of American factories, the pauperization of labor, and the exploitation of the home market speak a dark day for the original producer and the ultimate consumer in these United States.

THE ACME OF WILDCATTING.

I was glad that on Saturday the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], in his admirable address on this bill, pointed out that there were two features of this bill, and that one of them pertained to "investment bankers." This suggestion of his brings up for discussion the most dangerous part of this bill. As a matter of fact there is no need for these Edge concerns at the present time, so far as legitimate and sound foreign banking is concerned. That feature is amply taken care of by the foreign branch bank section of the Federal reserve act, and such branch banks are growing rapidly in foreign countries. They are found in South America, Haiti, France, and England, and furthermore the War Finance Corporation can take care of the situation so far as credits are concerned, and it is authorized to do so until one year after the termination of the war, as fixed by the proclamation of the President, all of which is indicated in a report by the director of said corporation to the Senate, dated October 11, 1919, in compliance with Senate resolution 204. Furthermore Mr. H. P. Davison, of the Morgan firm, has stated that this bill would not stabilize exchange.

Therefore there is no reason for the passage of this act except for the benefit of the "investment banker."

In the outset I said that the first paragraph of this bill is the whole bill, for here is where the so-called investment banker is permitted to immerse himself in immortal reservoirs of wealth. What is an investment banker? In the first place, he is not a banker. He is a broker or, in other words, an investment speculator. The words "New York investment banker" is just a polite word for a New York stock jobber, and this bill is for their particular benefit. There is no place in the bill where their speculation as brokers in foreign investments is regulated, defined, or controlled. It might be well called a bill for the protection of stock jobbers in their international speculations. Contemplating a big business in the sale of foreign wildcat stocks in America for good American coin, they have begun an agitation in this Congress to pass a bill to prevent the further sale of our native brand of wildcat securities in competition with them.

If there is a rumor that oil has been found in Armenia, that will be sufficient for the organization and promotion by these so-called investment bankers of hundreds of companies the sale of whose stocks and bonds they will promote. If a craze for Siberian gold overcomes us, those who are taken care of in this bill will see to it that the stock and bonds of the Siberian Gold Mining Co. get a fair chance in America.

We may expect to see promoted a factory for manufacturing the free energy of Garabed Giragossian in the Kingdom of the Hedjaz. Plantations of coffee in Brazil will offer them a chance to promote their stock. Associations for raising corn and cattle in Argentina will be a popular sort of investment offered the American people. The almond tree in Palestine will flourish, and so will the sale of the stock. The Spanish armada will be raised and the mines of King Solomon will be reopened. Stock and bonds on highly satisfactory terms, as advertised in the newspapers, in factories, mines, railroads, and canals in European, Asiatic, African, and South American companies will be offered to the American public. As after every great war people are anxious to engage in a stock-buying hysteria, so it would seem America is about to become the victim which will be largely caused and promoted by this enabling bill, supplemented by a first-class advertising campaign.

The first proposition in sight, as stated in the public press, is to the effect that experts are engaged in planning a modern scientific city outside the walls of Jerusalem. The prospectus shows that "the features of the ancient city will be preserved intact, while around it will be built a modern city of American

type, with skyscrapers, trolley cars, modern hotels, drainage, water supply, factories, theaters, and everything that could be desired. Thus the resident or visitor will be able to employ the opportunity of examining when he pleases the world's most sacred and picturesque city while living under conditions of modern comfort." The price of stock and bonds await the passage of this bill.

Recent events, as well as recent and modern history, teach us that the psychology of peoples has to do in a most important manner with their activities. In nations struggling under great war debts the tendency is toward speculation. Are we prepared to facilitate the selling of speculative stocks, the propagation of which will be magnified by our master geniuses of advertising so as to cause our people to desert the safe and sane methods involved in the purchase of home securities and plunge headlong into an insane saturnalia of foreign speculation?

Permit me to call attention, as a warning, to two instances in history: I refer first to the great stock-speculating epidemic which seized possession of the people of France in the early part of the eighteenth century, relating to a project known as "the Mississippi scheme," initiated by John Law, a Scotch "investment banker," whose scheme, approved by the regent, for the establishment of a company having exclusive privilege of "trading to the great river, Mississippi, and the Province of Louisiana, on its western bank," which territory was supposed to abound in precious metals, after being supported in a delirium of enthusiasm by the people of that country, fell with a crash.

Visions of great wealth took possession of the people. Shares advanced rapidly. A frenzy of speculation began. Issues of new shares from time to time added to the delusion. It affected the highest and lowest classes. Dukes, counts, duchesses, and countesses jostled daily with the proletariat in the narrow street before Law's house clamoring for stock. Apartments were rented in the locality at fabulous rates. Many accidents occurred in the alley, and the crowd was so great that a cobbler in the street made a fortune by letting his stall out and furnishing writing materials to applicants for stock, and a humped-back man who stood in the street gained a considerable sum by lending his hump as a writing desk for eager speculators. Later, when Law moved to the Hotel d'Soissons, tents were erected in the gardens in order to furnish places where stock jobbers and their clients could be early accommodated with stock. Courtiers, peers, judges, and bishops thronged his apartment for stock.

At the apex of the speculation some one demanded payment in specie. He was berated at first by the frenzied multitude, but soon others imitated him, and stocks began to fall, and people doubted the immense wealth of the Mississippi region. A run on the bank occurred, 15 persons being crushed to death in the doors of the bank. They demanded possession of Law and that he be torn to pieces. Thousands were rendered penniless, while a very few, who had disposed of their stocks early, gathered up their ill-gotten gains and departed from the country.

Another great delirium in stock speculating took possession of England in the early part of the same century, and was known as the South Sea bubble. Pope describes the times in the following language:

At length corruption, like a general flood,
Did deluge all, and avarice, creeping on,
Spread, like a low-born mist, and hid the sun.
Statesmen and patriots plied alike the stocks,
Peeress and butler shared alike the box;
And judges jobbed, and bishops bit the town,
And mighty dukes packed cards for half a crown:
Britain was sunk in lucre's sordid charms.

The South Sea Co. was given a monopoly of trade to the South Seas. It was one of the first foreign export trade corporations and by its propaganda everyone believed in the stories of inexhaustible gold and silver mines in Peru and along the eastern coast of South America.

The plan was to make everybody rich simply by sending English manufacturers to be repaid one hundredfold in gold and silver ingots by the natives. New concessions being granted from time to time by the Government, the stock arose with great rapidity at every discussion of the legislation. Mr. Robert Walpole alone stood out boldly against it. He claimed amid derision that the "dangerous practice of stockjobbing would divert the genius of the nation from trade and industry. It would lure to decay the unwary to their ruin by causing them to part with the hard earnings of their labor for the prospects of imaginary wealth." He prophetically declared "that if the plan proposed succeeded the directors would become the masters of the Government and control the action of the legislature." He was hailed as a false prophet and compared to the hoarse raven, croaking omens of evil.

Nevertheless the whole nation turned stockjobbers. "Exchange Alley was blocked and Cornhill was impassable." The inordinate thirst for gold could not be slaked, even in the South Sea.

Other promotion schemes of the wildcat kind were initiated. Bubbles sprang up everywhere and burst in a week or less.

Stock companies to make "deal boards out of sawdust," "a wheel for perpetual motion," "encouraging the breed of horses," "for improving glebe and church lands and repairing and rebuilding parsonage and vicarage houses," "carrying on wholesale fisheries in Greenland," "improving British alum works," "trading in hair," for "a settlement on the island of Vera Cruz," "importing walnut trees from Virginia," "employing poor artificers and furnishing merchants and others with watches," "colonization of Arcadia," and for many other extravagant purposes, were formed.

But the greatest of all concerns was one started by an unknown adventurer (and I do not make an application of his scheme to this bill), a concern entitled "A corporation for carrying on an undertaking of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is."

Finally, as in France, the storm broke.

"A most extraordinary panic seized upon the people. Men were running to and fro in alarm and terror, their imagination filled with great calamity, the form and dimension of which nobody knew."

Black it stood as night—
Pierce as 10 furies—
Terrible as hell.

Parliamentary inquiry disclosed a "degree of infamy, disgraceful alike to the morals of the offenders and the intellect of the people—a warning that nations like individuals can not become desperate gamblers with impunity."

And so, Mr. Chairman, in view of the great dangers impending upon the passage of this bill, the threatened destruction of American industries, the pauperization of American labor, the maintenance of the present high cost of living, the building and maintaining of American industries in foreign countries whose rights must be protected by the presence of thousands of troops raised among the young men of the country, the probability of great international complications, and the undoubted and certain coming of a national orgy of stock speculation to the ruin of millions, all occurring while the Nation is burdened with debt, suffering from the sorrows and ravages of war, and while general unrest prevails among our people, I plead with the proponents of this bill to withdraw it, and in the event of failure to do so, I appeal to the membership of this House to defeat it. [Applause.]

During the remarks of Mr. KING:

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the speech which the gentleman from Illinois is delivering is so important that it should be heard by more Members of the House, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOWELL). The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members present, a quorum.

Mr. KING concluded his remarks.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, there now being exactly 28 Members on the floor, not counting the pages, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-four Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Clark, Mo.	Edmonds	Goodwin, Ark.
Andrews, Md.	Classon	Elston	Gould
Ashbrook	Cleary	Emerson	Graham, Pa.
Babka	Cole	Esch	Green, Iowa
Bacharach	Cooper	Evans, Nebr.	Greene, Mass.
Barkley	Costello	Ferris	Griest
Bell	Crago	Fess	Griffin
Black	Crowther	Fields	Hamill
Bland, Ind.	Cullen	Fisher	Hamilton
Boies	Dallinger	Flood	Hardy, Tex.
Booher	Darrow	Fordney	Harrison
Bowers	Davey	Frear	Haskell
Britten	Davis, Minn.	Fuller, Ill.	Hawley
Brooks, Pa.	Dempsey	Fuller, Mass.	Heflin
Browning	Dewalt	Gallivan	Hicks
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Gandy	Hill
Butler	Doolling	Gaully	Holland
Caldwell	Doremus	Garland	Houghton
Campbell, Kans.	Doughton	Garner	Huddleston
Cantrill	Drane	Godwin, N. C.	Husted
Carew	Dunn	Goldfogle	Hutchinson
Carter	Eagan	Good	Ireland
Casey	Eagle	Goodall	Johnson, Ky.

Johnson, S. Dak.	Maher	Riordan	Sullivan
Johnson, Wash.	Mann, Ill.	Robison, Ky.	Sweet
Johnston, N. Y.	Mason	Rodenberg	Swope
Jones, Pa.	Mead	Rogers	Tague
Kelley, Mich.	Minahan, N. J.	Rouse	Taylor, Ark.
Kendall	Montague	Rowan	Temple
Kennedy, Iowa	Mooney	Rowe	Thomas
Kennedy, R. I.	Moore, Ohio	Rucker	Tillman
Kettner	Moore, Pa.	Sabath	Tincher
Kless	Moore, Va.	Sanders, Ind.	Tinkham
Kincheloe	Moore, Ind.	Sanders, La.	Treadway
Kinkaid	Morin	Sanders, N. Y.	Vare
Kreider	Mudd	Saunders, Va.	Venable
LaGuardia	Neely	Schall	Voigt
Langley	Nicholls, S. C.	Scully	Walsh
Lehlbach	O'Connell	Sherwood	Walters
Leshner	Ogden	Shreve	Ward
Little	Paige	Siegel	Watson, Pa.
Longworth	Parker	Sims	Webster
Luce	Pell	Sinclair	Welling
Lufkin	Peters	Sinnott	Welty
McClintic	Porter	Sisson	Whaley
McCulloch	Pou	Slemp	Wilson, Pa.
McGlennon	Radcliffe	Smith, Ill.	Winslow
McKenzie	Rainey, H. T.	Smith, N. Y.	Wise
McKeown	Rainey, J. W.	Snell	Woodyard
McKiniry	Ramsey	Snyder	Zihlman
McLane	Rayburn	Steele	
MacCrate	Reber	Stephens, Miss.	
Magee	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill S. 2472, and finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, when 212 Members answered to their names—a quorum—and he handed in the list of absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Massachusetts proceeds, I desire to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, which had under consideration the bill which is now before the House for consideration. Every opportunity was given to all of the interests affected by the bill to be heard before the committee. The only opposition which developed seems to have been made manifest through the opposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING]. The gentleman from Illinois expresses the fear that this is going to be a combination in restraint of trade. I think the gentleman is in error in that respect, because I think it is going to help trade in the United States.

The gentleman suggests that it will drive out of trade the small concerns in this country, and that they will be forced to do business with these large combinations of trade, and that that will work a great hardship. To my mind this matter of international trade is a very serious matter and one which I believe people who study the subject will agree with me when I say that no small concern in the United States, with conditions as they are at present, should attempt to enter the foreign trade. When we passed the amendments to the Clayton antitrust law, under the Webb-Pomerene Act, permitting concerns to combine to do international trade or business, one of the very purposes of the bill is to finance business originating by authority of this Webb-Pomerene Act. Many of these small concerns have not the credit facilities, and great risks are involved should they assume the risks incident to the financing of this foreign business.

The United States to-day is on the eve of the greatest prosperity that it could ever have hoped for. Industrially it expanded to a point beyond all expectations 10 years ago. In natural resources we are superabundant. This country produces 20 per cent of the world's supply of gold, 25 per cent of the world's supply of wheat, 40 per cent of the world's iron and steel, 40 per cent of the world's silver, 50 per cent of the world's zinc, 52 per cent of the world's coal, 60 per cent of the world's aluminum, 60 per cent of the world's cotton, 66 per cent of the world's supply of oil, and 75 per cent of the world's corn. This country refines 80 per cent of the world's copper and operates 40 per cent of the world's railroads.

A harvest of wealth from the farms of this broad, rich land such as has never before been recorded in the world's history is in prospect.

But most valuable of all the stimulus which the dire necessities of war supplied to American inventiveness, resourcefulness, productiveness, courage, and spirit of adventure constitutes a national asset which not only transcends the bounds of material computation, but also challenges the boldest imagination.

Financially, we are in the best position of any country in the world, and our leading competitors in the fight for domination of control in finance are looking to us to-day for loans and credits, and all of the devastated countries of Europe are looking to us for food products and the necessary materials for rehabilitation purposes.

All that is needed in this country to-day is simply constructive Government leadership for and cooperation with business generally to insure full and free development of our unequalled resources and opportunities.

Our exports for the month of June reached the enormous sum of \$918,000,000, exceeding by over \$200,000,000 the highest previous month's record. Our imports were only \$293,000,000, leaving a trade balance of \$625,000,000 in our favor. The trade balance in our favor at the end of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1919, was \$4,129,000,000. To this should be added the silver which we exported, amounting to \$222,000,000. It is true that there has been some decline in the latter months in our exports, but I mention this simply to show that now, notwithstanding the fact that the war has ended, that the demand from the world for the products of this country is continuing in large amounts and will continue for several years to come, providing a definite plan of financing these operations so as to maintain an even balance of exchange and permit the settlement on a proper basis for the products exported, and further providing for the ultimate and future settlement of the operations additionally created.

This situation presents an interesting one when taken into consideration with our own domestic situation as presented by the brotherhoods affecting labor and the increased cost of living in this country. What is needed more than anything else to help solve the situation is increased production. There never was a time in the history of this country when this should be more pertinent than the present. Everyone understands that eventually the United States will get back upon a normal basis.

To return to a normal basis immediately is what is needed, and in order to do this this country must speed up. We have the markets and to supply the markets we have the raw materials, the machinery, and the labor, and the incentive should be accelerated by educating the elements of unrest into a sense of duty to their country to get back immediately to work, and hard work, and forget for the moment the question of equitable readjustment of wages.

Let the United States pull together all of her resources, including raw materials, industry, labor, and finance, and we will so fix the position of the United States that for future years she will be the dominating power in the world. There is every selfish reason why the United States should speed up to her fullest capacity. We have a bonded and floating debt of \$30,000,000,000. The interest burden and the increased cost of doing the Government's business occasioned by these new conditions impel us to at the earliest possible moment liquidate our indebtedness. The only way we can hope to do this is by increasing production.

One great trouble in this country to-day is that everyone is looking for a snap—shorter hours, with as little real work as possible, and big wages, good clothes, automobiles. We have been tending toward leisure and extravagance instead of comfort and conservation.

This bill has for its purpose the providing in part the machinery to facilitate the sale to the world of our surplus of production and to provide facilities to enable the world to pay us, which production is now so greatly needed in war-devastated Europe.

In 1920 France wants \$750,000,000 worth, Italy wants \$600,000,000, and Belgium wants \$200,000,000, to say nothing of the demand of England and the other countries, a probable total of \$2,000,000,000 which they will want outside of the usual demand, all depending upon our ability to accept the kind of settlement these countries can give.

They have no gold to spare in settlement of the over \$4,000,000,000 due us in balance of trade as of June 30 last. To this must be added the present year's increase less our imports, which certainly will not exceed our imports for some years to come, if every again. So that at the end of the next fiscal year we can expect an unsettled balance in our favor of probably \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit, is the gentleman going to deal with the South American trade?

Mr. McFADDEN. I was not. I was dealing with it as a whole. That is tremendously important, however. This bill will care for South American trade as well as European.

We must not lose sight of the fact, too, that in the past five years we have changed from a debtor to a creditor nation;

that instead of our owing the world some \$5,000,000,000, the world owes us at least \$16,000,000,000, made up of direct war loans to our Allies in the war of \$10,000,000,000, as per letter which I insert at this point:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, September 15, 1919.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of the 9th instant and take pleasure in informing you that the credits established by the Secretary of the Treasury in favor of foreign Governments and cash advanced against these credits as at the close of business September 11, 1919, were as follows:

	Credits established.	Cash advanced.
Belgium.....	\$343,445,000.00	\$338,745,000.00
Cuba.....	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
Czechoslovakia.....	55,330,000.00	52,690,000.00
France.....	3,047,974,777.24	2,782,477,800.00
Great Britain.....	4,310,000,000.00	4,277,000,000.00
Greece.....	48,235,629.05
Italy.....	1,619,922,872.99	1,600,775,945.99
Liberia.....	5,000,000.00	18,000.00
Romania.....	25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
Russia.....	187,729,750.00	187,729,750.00
Serbia.....	26,780,465.56	26,780,465.56
Total.....	9,685,419,494.84	9,301,216,951.53

Charges of \$188,236,629.05 have been made against these credits in addition to cash advances shown.

Very truly, yours,

ALBERT RATHBONE.

Hon. LOUIS T. McFADDEN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Also four billions balance of trade are due, and at least \$2,000,000,000 of privately negotiated loans held by financial institutions and private investors in the country. A complete turn-over of \$21,000,000,000 which we paid to Europe to help her finance the war. It is interesting to add to this amount the total cost to this country of the war, as of June 30, 1919, of \$30,177,000,000, or a total of \$51,177,000,000, which this country has financed during the past four years.

In considering this situation we should not overlook the effect of the change from a debtor to a creditor nation. The fact that we no longer pay an interest charge to the world of at least \$250,000,000 and that we will no longer pay shipping charges to the extent previously paid by us owing to our increased shipping facilities of \$150,000,000, and that we will also save another \$150,000,000 in insurance premiums, which used to go abroad, a total of \$550,000,000, and added to this must be the interest on at least \$12,000,000,000, which is owed the Government of the United States and private investors, for which we hold obligations, with interest, which must amount to at least \$600,000,000. Add to this what we previously had to pay Europe and you have \$1,150,000,000, which Europe must pay this country annually more than before the war.

In other words, the world must pay this amount in gold or merchandise to the United States, which is, of course, a handicap to Europe in dealing with this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield me five minutes?

Mr. PHELAN. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is extended for five minutes.

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. BROWNE. In regard to the saving on insurance premiums being sent abroad, I did not just understand how that saving is produced?

Mr. McFADDEN. Before the war this amount of insurance was carried with German and English companies. During the war, of course, the German companies were closed out and the people in the United States are paying more of their insurance premiums to the companies in this country than ever before.

Mr. BROWNE. Does the gentleman know how much that would amount to?

Mr. McFADDEN. The total amount, I suppose, would be \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 which we were paying to foreign companies.

One would certainly think from a careful study of this entire situation that the United States must assume the leadership in finance of the world, a situation not of her own seeking but by the necessity of the occasion, a thing as a country we have a right to be proud of, made possible by the development of our great resources under a form of government such as we are fortunate enough to possess, due to the foresight of our forefathers in so wisely providing under the Constitution, which fact should be a strong argument for the upholding of this Constitution and our Government under it, which has protected

our country during all this development and permitted us to attain the present height and supremacy as a world power.

The war cost has been estimated at over \$200,000,000,000. The debts of allied countries of Europe are held mostly within their borders, the largest outside credit being to this country.

Germany's debt is likewise held by her own people, with the exception of the indemnity which is to be paid to the allied countries in reparation, which I believe has been agreed upon in the peace treaty as twenty-five billions of dollars in money besides the replacement of much physical property.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Germany will be carrying the burden of paying this country the difference brought about by these changed conditions between this country and the world. Financially the interest charge Germany must pay to our allies will amount to \$1,250,000,000 annually. In other words, she must pay in gold or merchandise.

An interesting conclusion might mean that Germany would be paying to this country in merchandise the interest which she owes to our allies to balance that which the Allies may owe us, which she knows so well how to efficiently produce. This, then, in view of the situation, makes the statement "that German labor and industry have gone on a 12-hour per day time"—quite in contrast with our own situation as regards production—very interesting and worthy of our careful consideration.

A study of this world-wide financial situation can not but make for serious thought, and in anticipating what the future has in store for this country one is bound to conclude that the financial requirements of the lesser countries of the world, which heretofore have been financed in London and the other financial centers of the Old World, must of necessity come to this country for that future relief. And I am not sure but in this lies the solution of our intertrade relations with the world. Certainly the opportunity is here. Will we meet it? It is a case of the survival of the fittest. I say that we will meet the issue fairly and squarely and thus assume the financial leadership of the world.

This measure is one step to perfect the machinery with which to operate. We have long been seeking trade with the world, and our opportunity is now here, but with that opportunity comes naturally the responsibility of financing it. Let us meet the challenge as Americans have always met every challenge and go in to conquer and overcome the obstacles and win the victory in finance and trade.

Therefore I think that a combination of capital such as provided for in this bill is absolutely necessary to maintain our foreign business.

Now, we all realize, of course, in the financing of this great volume of business which is knocking at our doors, that some instrument must be created to take care of the payments that those countries in Europe have to give us. This instrument is nothing more than a hopper into which will pour long-time credits which may be in the form of notes, which may be in the form of bonds of municipalities, or bonds or stocks issued by companies in France, England, or other parts of the world, which may be guaranteed or secured by the Governments or municipalities. Into this hopper they will flow, and out of this hopper will flow obligations of this company in a suitable form, a desirable form, for our people to invest their savings in. That is about the sum and substance of what is contemplated under this act. There are other powers given, but they are incident to this main purpose. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield a half minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the signing of the armistice between Italy and Austria and the achievements of the Italian Army in the recent war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the present bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the present bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is nothing more important to the producing masses of America than the continuance of proper facilities for maintaining our foreign trade. There never came to this Nation since its birth, and probably never will come again, a situation so auspicious or so full of opportunity. The conditions confronting us accentuate the necessity for the wisest and most constructive legislative program on the part of the Government, as well as the most far-seeing financial policy on the part of the business men of the country. It is to be regretted that on a subject like this, which is in a large sense technical, and, with many Members of the House not present, so many surprising assertions should be indulged in in this discussion. This bill—or substantially this bill—passed the Senate during the last session of Congress. The same measure, without many of the restrictions and safeguards which are offered and reported as amendments to the pending bill, was approved by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and passed by the Senate during this session. As reported to the House it has the unanimous support of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, excepting the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING]. There are some able lawyers and experienced and successful bankers on the committees of Congress that have approved this bill. In the face of all this it seems remarkable that only one member of either of these committees should have discovered the alarming tendencies of the bill which have been recited this afternoon by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

The situation respecting our foreign trade is such that something should be done to make sure that the farmers and manufacturers of the Nation shall not suffer from a severe slump in our exports and sudden and sweeping decline in prices. We are told that for the fiscal year ending June 30 last our exports exceeded imports between four and five billions of dollars. Our trade during that period, including both imports and exports, reached the stupendous sum of more than \$10,000,000,000. This vast volume of business can not be handled to the best advantage of the American people without some new method of international banking. The American dollar has advanced until it is worth \$1.12, as it relates to the British pound sterling. In France and Italy it is even much higher, and in Germany higher still. This is bound to result in the impairment of our foreign trade to the great detriment of the cotton growers, the wheat growers, the cattle raisers, the manufacturers, the laborers, and every interest of the American people. We must maintain and increase our production and continue to ship our goods to the markets of the world if we hope to preserve our marvelous prosperity.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] pointed out quite clearly how the present exchange situation affects the producers of this country. Ten thousand pounds sterling is worth \$48,600. But if an English firm has to draw exchange with which to buy cotton, or wheat, or cattle, the £10,000 will be worth only \$41,500 in this country. This makes a difference of \$7,100. This sum represents about 40 bales of cotton at present prices. If we had in operation the banking system which the present bill seeks to establish, the same firm could go to the American branch bank or agency in Liverpool or London and negotiate a loan by putting up securities there which would be handled in this country without this vast loss in exchange. The difference would enable the English firm to pay about 6 cents a pound more for American cotton than under existing conditions. This would mean a saving to American cotton growers of an amount almost equal to the total value of the cotton crop of the United States when the crop used to sell at 7 and 8 cents a pound. The same illustration holds good as to wheat, cattle, and other products.

Our foreign trade is being taken care of now by the operation of policies inaugurated during the war. It is no longer desired, in view of the enormous trade balance in our favor, that the regular banks of the country should undertake to handle this trade. It involves transactions too large, with risks that should not be attempted by the regular banks. We have a banking system that meets every requirement incident to normal conditions in the commercial life of the Nation, and which during the test and strain of the recent war which we were called upon to finance, both for our allies and ourselves, gave us first place in the financial affairs of the world. It has brought a period of prosperity unparalleled in our history, and enabled us to finance and win the greatest war of all time. The Federal reserve act and the Federal farm-loan act have given an impetus to agricultural, industrial, and commercial activity never known before. These acts have given independence to farmers and producers by furnishing an ample supply of credit. The present bill is designed to supplement

those great measures of constructive legislation by providing a system that will cover the field of international banking just as those acts have supplied our domestic needs.

The Congress has heretofore authorized the War Finance Corporation to the extent of \$1,000,000,000 to take care of the work of carrying on our foreign trade. That bill, as I remember, met with no serious objection. But the Federal Reserve Board and all whose opinion on the subject would be considered of value have concluded that it is not best that the Federal Government shall extend its credit further to assist other nations, even though it be to promote their rehabilitation, upon which our own prosperity in large part must depend.

The Federal reserve act authorized banks with a capital and surplus of a million dollars or more to establish foreign branches, but only one institution has taken advantage of that act by going into foreign-branch business. This was the National City Bank of New York. It has a combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of nearly \$100,000,000. This bank has quite a number of branches doing a large business throughout the world. Later an amendment to the Federal reserve act was passed on September 7, 1916, allowing banks with a capital and surplus of as much as \$1,000,000 to take stock in foreign branches or banks engaged in financing foreign trade. Eight foreign-trade banks have been established, to the capital stock of which national banks have subscribed. These institutions are incorporated under State laws and do a banking business, though they do not receive deposits. On September 17, 1919, another amendment to the Federal reserve act was passed giving national banks the right to subscribe not to exceed 5 per cent of their capital and surplus to institutions known as export finance corporations, whether organized under Federal or State laws. The bill before us provides a plan which it is hoped will result in bringing all these institutions into one system under Federal charters and under strict control of law, with ample power of supervision and regulation placed in the Federal Reserve Board.

They are not permitted to operate upon a capital of less than \$2,000,000, which can not be impaired by the payment of dividends or otherwise. They are not permitted to organize except with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board. They are subject to examination in practically the same manner as national banks. They are prohibited from controlling or attempting to control prices or form combinations to restrain trade. They are not allowed to receive deposits except such as are incidental to the general purpose for which they are established. In fact, severe penalties are provided to prevent the possibility of any and all of the wrongs and abuses of which we have just heard so much.

If it may be contended that any of the institutions already established embody the possibility of danger to the stability or safety of our financial affairs, as insisted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING], it is only a greater reason why the act before us should be passed. The passage of this act will tend to bring all these institutions into the one system around which we are throwing more thorough safeguards and restrictions. For my own part, I fail to see anything in these other institutions to create alarm. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] seems frightened by the Webb bill and seems to base his opposition to the present bill on his fears of the other measure. Yet the Webb bill has already been enacted into law and is in operation to-day. A number of institutions have been organized under it in which the banks of the country have taken stock. The Webb bill is in full force already, and if any of the dire things referred to here to-day have resulted from the operation of that law, I have not heard of them. But if such danger exists in that law, they should be dealt with in a logical legislative way to cure them or to repeal the act. I submit that it is not fair argument to assail the bill now under consideration on account of supposed defects in former legislation. The fact is, however, that actual experience shows those defects do not exist.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I prefer not to yield. My time is limited, and I want to say one or to other things before I finish. The truth is, gentlemen, that instead of being designed to offer opportunities for the sort of wildcat transactions that have been mentioned this afternoon by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING], this bill is intended to throw additional and more secure safeguards around this kind of business. It may be that these other corporations that may be organized either by the States or by the Federal Government are not covered by the regulations and restrictions that ought to be provided. If so, it is only another reason why Congress should pass the present bill. If this act is passed it is confidently hoped that these corporations organized under State laws will come into the new system under Federal

control, where the safeguards contained in the present law will apply and where the Federal Reserve Board will have the power of examination, regulation, and control. So it will be seen that instead of conferring an enlargement or a careless expansion of the dangerous sort of power referred to, this bill will in the very necessity of things promote stability and operate to restrain the tendencies pictured by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

Why, the gentleman seems to fear that the Federal Reserve Board is going to put their approval on all sorts of crooked and corrupt practices and combinations in restraint of trade such as has not been known in this country in recent years. I do not believe it. The people of my section of the country have great confidence in the Federal Reserve Board, and this is true throughout the land. The administration of the Federal reserve act by the Federal Reserve Board has given the producing masses of the South and West the greatest opportunity those sections have ever known, and it is being reflected in an increased production and prosperity that is of great benefit to the entire Nation and the world. The power placed in the Federal Reserve Board under this act will be used to restrain and control these institutions. The power will not be abused. It will be exercised to promote the interest of all sections and all classes and will help to preserve the high place we have attained in the financial affairs of the world. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GREEN of Iowa having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 7751) authorizing the sale of inherited and unpartitioned allotments for town-site purposes in the Quapaw Agency, Okla.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. FRANCE and Mr. WALSH of Montana members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Civil Service Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. FRANCE and Mr. WALSH of Montana members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Interior Department.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there are only 34 gentlemen on the floor, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-eight gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. PLATT. I move that the committee do now rise, and on that motion I ask for tellers.

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order against that. It is out of order. You can not ask tellers on a roll call.

Mr. PLATT. I make the motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. BLANTON. I make a point of order that the Chair, having stated that there was no quorum, the only thing on earth he can do is to have a roll call.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the committee can rise whether there is a quorum present or not. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. PLATT and Mr. PHELAN took their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 5, noes 57.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the yeas are 5 and the noes 57, and the committee refuses to rise. A quorum not being present, the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Flood	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Lufkin	Sanford
Anthony	Fordney	McArthur	Saunders, Va.
Ashbrook	Frear	McClintic	Schall
Bakka	French	McCulloch	Scully
Bacharach	Fuller, Ill.	McDuffie	Sells
Barkley	Fuller, Mass.	McGlennon	Sherwood
Bell	Gallivan	McKenzie	Shreve
Benson	Gandy	McKeown	Siegel
Black	Ganly	McKinley	Sims
Boles	Garland	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Booher	Garner	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sisson
Bowers	Godwin, N. C.	MacCrate	Slomp
Britten	Goldfogle	Magee	Small
Brooks, Pa.	Good	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Browning	Goodall	Mann, Ill.	Snell
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Snyder
Butler	Goodykoontz	Mason	Steele
Caldwell	Gould	Mead	Stephens, Miss.
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Merritt	Stinnes
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Minahan, N. J.	Strong, Pa.
Carew	Greene, Mass.	Montague	Sullivan
Carter	Griest	Moon	Summers, Tex.
Casey	Griffin	Mooney	Sweet
Chindblom	Hamill	Moore, Ohio	Swope
Clark, Fla.	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Pa.	Tague
Clark, Mo.	Harrison	Moores, Ind.	Taylor, Ark.
Cleary	Haskell	Morin	Taylor, Tenn.
Cole	Hawley	Mudd	Temple
Cooper	Hayden	Neely	Thomas
Costello	Hefflin	Nicholls, S. C.	Tillman
Crago	Hicks	O'Connell	Tincher
Crowther	Hill	Ogden	Tinkham
Cullen	Holland	Oldfield	Treadway
Curry, Calif.	Houghton	Paige	Upshaw
Dallinger	Husted	Parker	Vare
Darrow	Hutchinson	Pell	Venable
Davey	Ireland	Peters	Voigt
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Ky.	Porter	Volstead
Dempsey	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Walsh
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Radcliffe	Walters
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Rainey, H. T.	Ward
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, J. W.	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Jones, Pa.	Ramsey	Webb
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Rayburn	Wellington
Doughton	Kendall	Reber	Welty
Drane	Kennedy, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Whaley
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Riddick	Wheeler
Eagan	Kettner	Riordan	White, Kans.
Eagle	Kloss	Robison, Ky.	Wilson, Pa.
Edmonds	Kincheloe	Rodenberg	Winslow
Elliott	Kreider	Rogers	Wise
Emerson	LaGuardia	Rouse	Woodward
Fisch	Langley	Rowan	Yates
Evans, Nebr.	Lehbach	Rowe	Zihlman
Ferris	Leshner	Sabath	
Fess	Little	Sanders, Ind.	
Fields	Longworth	Sanders, La.	

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration Senate bill 2472, and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called, whereupon 202 Members answered to their names—a quorum—and he presented a list of the absentees to be recorded in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The list of absentees will be recorded in the Journal.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not make it. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BLANTON. There are only a few Members in the House.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Thereupon the committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 2472, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. PLATT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from New York a question. I understand that this bill, in the opinion of those who have studied it carefully, would be of very great value in financing our exports, and particularly financing exports like cotton, of which we have a great surplus. Is that the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. PLATT. That is true.

Mr. MONDELL. That being true, how does it happen that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], coming from a great cotton State, is conducting a filibuster against the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman from Wyoming speaking in the time of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MONDELL. I was. I wondered why the gentleman from Louisiana was conducting a filibuster against a bill which would be of such great value to the cotton planters of the South.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KING. It is probably because he sees the danger of this bill to the cotton planter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in justice to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] I think he ought to be present before the gentleman propounds a question to him. He is not here. I think the gentleman from Wyoming should wait until he comes here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is not recognized and is out of order. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT]. Does the gentleman from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PLATT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN] 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield a moment to me?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will yield for a very brief question or statement. I yield half a minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Chairman, California has never disappointed her admirers. She has always taken her place in the forefront of every progressive movement.

On Saturday, at a specially called session of the legislature, by a unanimous vote of the senate and by a vote in the assembly of 73 to 2 the State ratified the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

California is the eighteenth State to ratify the suffrage amendment. The National Woman's Party has reached the half-way post. Their work is all but accomplished. Success can never be in doubt when justice and determination work together. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have been very much interested in this bill because of its effect on the immediate situation, to wit, the matter of the demoralization of foreign exchanges and its effect on our exports, and especially the exports of cotton and of wheat. But of that I spoke briefly on the rule on Saturday. I have been much concerned about the necessity for this measure for the purpose of organizing and maintaining our place in the world's trade with all the solvent nations of the world after we shall have resumed the ordinary conditions of trade.

This morning I was considerably surprised at the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING], in which he arraigned the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, a majority of them of the best Republicans that are over there, and in which he arraigned the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, all of whom favor the bill except himself, 13 of whom are Republicans and 12 of them favoring the bill, as being ready to deliver this country bound hand and foot into the hands of Plutus, who never appeared before the committee, so far as the hearings show, and into the hands of Croesus, with whom the committee has not even a speaking acquaintance. [Laughter and applause.]

I was really surprised also that the main burden of the speech of the gentleman was that it was a combination with another iniquity, to wit, the Webb Act, passed by this Congress in 1917 for the purpose of helping the export business of this country, and the fact that the Webb Act took one-third of his time in announcing its iniquities and enormities. And then I went out here and looked to see when the Webb Act was passed and who voted for it, and I found that on June 13, 1917, the Webb Act was passed by a vote of 242 yeas against 29 nays, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] was one of the fellows who voted to pass it. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, if his judgment was so at fault two years ago as to vote to pass that which he has stated here to-day was an enormity that will deliver the people of America, bound hand and foot, into the hands of Plutus and Croesus and the money power of Wall Street, I do not think we can afford to follow his judgment when it comes to voting on this bill, because his hindsight has been very much better than his foresight, if he is correct to-day. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, gentlemen, this bill, as I said, is designed, first, to help to reestablish normal exchange conditions in the United States. It is designed, secondly, to help establish institutions

which will result in the trade of this country being stimulated and preserved and built up in all of the great solvent countries of the world when we resume ordinary national relations. I have stated already the immediate effect on foreign exchange. But before I go on with that I want to direct attention to another thing, and that is that the very thing that would be done under these charters to be granted under this act is now being done under State charters. And what is the difference? The difference is this, that those State charters are as broad as the earth, that they have no restrictions which the Government of the United States can enforce; that they can do all the things that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] speaks of, and this Government has no redress, because it can not forfeit their charters or go in and wind up the corporation. This is a provision for the organizing of institutions to do that same business, restricted in every particular and against every objection made by the gentleman from Illinois, as you will see when we come to read the bill under the five-minute rule, as to the objections which he makes.

Now, let us look at the situation a minute. I have heard a good deal of objection on the outside that this would be a measure which would result in our loaning great sums of money to Europe, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] says this is a bureaucratic bill for the purpose of going into this foreign trade. Let us look at it a minute. The bureau to which he refers is the Federal Reserve Board. To-day the Finance Corporation of the United States, with the governor of the Federal Reserve Board as the presiding genius of that corporation, has the right, under authority granted by legislation in which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] participated, to invest a billion dollars of the money of the United States in this very business for the purpose of encouraging and advancing exports. Now, we do not want him to do that, because that means more taxation, more bonds, and more debts for the United States. Consequently, we want to provide so that the National Government may have, subject to its control, subject to its limitations and under its backing, an institution which will enable this country to do business with all the world under the present condition and to encourage our exports, which are the life of our trade and the foundation of our national prosperity.

They talk about our dealing with Europe. Let us look at that for a minute. The exports of the United States now largely go to Europe—and why? They go to Europe because England and Germany and France have always financed the exports of their own merchants, and they have gone to South America; and when the importer in the Argentine or in Brazil wants goods, does he come to us? No. We sell our cotton to England, and she manufactures it and sells the manufactured product to Brazil and Argentina and Venezuela and to South Africa and to India and to China and Japan. Why? Because they have their arrangements so that the importer in those countries can get six months' time on his purchase, while no banking institutions in this country have the right to loan on those bills for more than 90 days. Now, what is it proposed that we shall do? An importer in the Argentine wants a cargo of cotton goods. He comes to the representative of the cotton manufacturers of New England and says, "I want your goods, but I want them on six months' time. The Government of my country will say to you that my credit is good. I will accept on six months' time and take a cargo of your goods." Can we handle that now? No; except through these State institutions that are working in a limited way; but with the institutions that we propose to create we can handle that exporter. Suppose we have a bill of \$100,000 accepted at six months by this importer in the Argentine, and he is certified to be worth \$1,000,000 and it is absolutely good. If I ship the goods, can I not get the money for the six months? If you go to one of your great banks you can not do it, because 90 days is the limit.

But take it to one of these great export banks, and the bank will discount the acceptance at six months and carry it. The goods go to South America and the merchant there gets in touch with our export business, and he comes back and trades with us year after year, as long as he can get the accommodations he needs, and it is all to the good of America. Why do I say so? Because if that is not done the English manufacturer will step in. He will have it financed in that way. He will sell the goods, and you establish a triangle whereby we ship the raw cotton from Norfolk to Liverpool, and they manufacture it and ship the manufactured product to the Argentine. They get a cargo of the products of Argentina that we need to bring to New York to be sold here. They make two profits. We have lost a profit and lost the trade by not being prepared to carry it on. That is to be the great foundation stone of our national prosperity, the power to do business with the waiting peoples in

Argentina, in Brazil, in Chile, in Venezuela, in South Africa, in India, in every port of the world where the commerce of the United States can be carried by the great mercantile fleet that we are building up, and that I hope to see on every sea, in every port where there is trade to be obtained for the manufacturer and the farmer and the producer of every kind in the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of objection has been made to this measure on the ground that we say they must be "principally" engaged in this business. Well, now, let us see what they can be principally engaged in. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] said that there could be a combination, that these corporations could become stockholders in the corporations organized under the Webb Act, and that a great combination could be made. Let us see what kind of a corporation they can participate in. They must have the consent of the Federal Reserve Board before they can buy a dollar's worth of stock in any corporation, and then they can only buy stock in a corporation—

engaged principally in the business of banking or in any other financial operation of the kinds authorized by this section, but not transacting business in the United States.

Now, how could the gentleman see a ghost in that? They can not acquire stock in any corporation except other corporations not substantial competitors of them, and it must be a corporation that is engaged in the same kind of business and not engaged in business in the United States. Now, no law of the United States reaches beyond the 3-mile limit. Therefore that is not giving any additional power of combination beyond the power already possessed by every corporation in the United States; because, if you go over to Cuba, a corporation in the United States can combine all it wants to over there.

But we did not stop there. On the next page we find the following:

No corporation organized under this section shall carry on any part of its business in the United States except such as, in the judgment of the Federal Reserve Board, shall be incidental to its international or foreign business.

Now, what do we mean by that? A corporation has one of these branches in Liverpool. A cotton merchant wants to buy cotton in the United States. He goes to the bank in Liverpool, deposits his money, leaves it there, and comes over and draws a draft for £10,000. He gets only \$41,500 instead of \$46,800 if he could bring the gold here or had the money in New York. That party could go to the branch in Liverpool or the institution in New York and borrow the money on the same collateral, borrow it and place it in the banks in New York and get \$48,500. That would be a deposit incidental to the business carried on, and that is what they mean by that. When he did that he could check that money out in paying for cotton, and instead of getting only \$41,500 on a £10,000 credit he would get \$48,600 worth of cotton, and if he paid it out for cotton he could pay 6 cents a pound more for it than he could on the basis of exchange to-day. That is an illustration of what we mean by the business being only incidental.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. The gentleman a moment ago made the statement that I would like to ask two questions about. One is, do these banking corporations receive deposits; is that the intention?

Mr. STEVENSON. Not to receive deposits in the United States except where they are incidental to the business that I have already illustrated.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that it would be a drain upon the finances of the United States if he put in action the method he has just stated?

Mr. STEVENSON. If it is a drain on the United States and its finances to fix it so that the manufacturer and the farmer of the United States of America can sell their goods in every market of the world, and sell them for the highest price—compete with those who have driven us off the seas and out of the markets of the world, making our ships hang up rotting at the wharves—it is a new law of trade to me. [Applause.]

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. Regarding the deposits, according to the act these financial corporations are not allowed to receive deposits from citizens of the United States or do a general banking business. They can issue debentures, bonds, and borrow money to the extent of ten times their capital stock and surplus provided it has the approval of the Federal Board. Now, if banking corporation stockholders are liable for double the amount of their stock holdings—

Mr. STEVENSON. My time is limited; and I wish the gentleman would come to his question as soon as possible.

Mr. DUNBAR. Why do you limit the amount of the liability in this act to their subscription for stock?

Mr. STEVENSON. I am glad that the gentleman asked that question. It will come up under the five-minute rule, but I will say that we prohibit their receiving local deposits. The double-liability provision that is in all of the banking laws is expressly to protect the innocent depositor who places his money there because it is a bank. It has the word "bank" written over it, and he thinks it is a good place to put his money, and usually it is. The bank is trustee and the officers are trustees for the depositors. The Government has always said that when you invite citizens of the United States to put their money in the bank, exercising the highest degree of good faith, you must be prepared to protect them to the extent of double what you put in it.

Mr. MADDEN. And there may be deposits to the extent of thirty times the amount of the capital, which is three times more than the amount allowed here for the issue of debentures, bonds, and so forth.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. When it comes to the notes, debentures, and bonds, that is the time when Plutus will show up and Cæsus may figure on these things, and when they do they can take care of themselves. They will look into the solvency of the institution before they buy the investment. They are on notice that they are making investments. They are not in the class where little Mary and Susan and Jane who work in somebody's kitchen put their little bit in the bank until they can save enough for a wedding dress. These men who buy these debentures and bonds and notes are able to take care of themselves, according to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. Is it not a fact that the Federal bank directors are held in such confidence and esteem by the people of the United States that when this proposed financial corporation announces that they have bonds to sell to ten times the extent of their capital stock and surplus—is it not a fact that the confidence of the people in these institutions will invite small investments?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. PHELAN. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. STEVENSON. In reply to the gentleman from Indiana, it is true that the Federal Reserve Board is held in high esteem, and that these things can not be put out beyond what they propose. They are holding those engaged in business to six times the capital stock, and that is the guardianship that is over the rich investor who buys these bonds, and the guardianship of the stock is sufficient to give that solvency to the corporation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a single question?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, they can not issue any of these debentures without having the collateral behind them on which to base the issue?

Mr. STEVENSON. No; they have to put up the collateral, and that collateral is pledged, and the man who buys the debentures knows what the collateral is.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I can not yield. He knows what the risks are, and he has the money to risk, and he buys it because he expects to make money by the transaction, and he is not, therefore, entitled to any more protection than a man who loans another a thousand dollars on his note with a neighbor as indorser. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is not on the floor. I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago, and in my absence he put into the Record a question purporting to ask why I am filibustering against this bill that means something to the cotton farmers of the South. I am not filibustering against this bill. I am for this bill, and no person in this House or in this world knows better than the gentleman from Wyoming what has developed the situation. I have taken as little time on the floor of this House as any gentleman who is a Member of this House.

A week ago I went to the gentleman from Wyoming and asked his permission—bowing, as I did, to the autocratic rule established by him that each ordinary Member must go and get on his knees and beg his permission—I went and asked permission to speak for 35 minutes. He knew I wanted to reveal the rotten leadership of the Republican Party in this House, and he notified me personally that I could not speak on that subject. He knew also that the election occurs in Massachusetts to-

morrow, and I was to expose the partisanship manifested by that examining committee against the Democratic candidate in Massachusetts. He refused to let me speak, and I notified him then and there that he would gain time by permitting me to speak even for only 35 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the words just spoken by the gentleman be taken down.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that unless those words are a reflection either upon the gentleman from Wyoming or upon the House it would be improper to have them taken down, and I submit they are no reflection—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand that they be taken down under the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Either upon the gentleman from Wyoming or on the House.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall call the attention of the House to the fact that those words are not the truth.

Mr. ASWELL. Did I not go to your side and ask permission to speak, and did you not say that I could not speak except by unanimous consent?

Mr. MONDELL. I will say at the present time—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. Does the gentleman insist on having the words reported?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I ask that the words of the gentleman from Wyoming be taken down wherein he said—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is out of order and will be seated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of asking that the words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman from Wyoming this question, to which he will please respond. Does the gentleman from Wyoming still desire that the words of the gentleman from Louisiana be taken down and reported?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing intervening at this time. Until this business before the House is disposed of the Chair will recognize no one. Subsequently we will take up the other matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. In reference to words spoken which a Member has the right to ask be taken down, is it not in order at that time to ask that they be taken down?

The CHAIRMAN. It is; and it will be in order as soon as this is disposed of, but you can not pile one on top of the other.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUBEY. After those words are reported, will it then be too late to ask that the words of the gentleman from Wyoming be taken down?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not. The Clerk will report to the committee the words as taken down.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASWELL. A week ago I went to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and asked his permission, bowing, as I did, to the autocratic rule established by him, that each ordinary Member must go and get on his knees and beg his permission—I went and asked him to speak for 35 minutes. He knew I wanted to reveal the rotten leadership of the Republican Party in this House, and he notified me personally that I could not speak on that subject. He knew also that the election occurs in Massachusetts to-morrow and I was to expose the partisanship manifested by that examining committee against the Democratic candidate in Massachusetts. He refused to let me speak, and I notified him then and there that he would gain time by permitting me to speak even for only 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The words under the rule are to be reported to the House for its consideration. The Chair calls to the chair as Speaker pro tempore the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. To what particular language does the gentleman object?

Mr. MONDELL. I object to the language which states that the gentleman spoke to me about the subject that he proposed to discuss; that states I knew the subject he proposed to discuss; and affirms I had knowledge of the subject he proposed to discuss and that I objected to his addressing the House because of that fact.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a single question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2472, in an address delivered to the Chair by

the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] made the point of order that the words spoken were out of order. Thereupon the Chair ordered that the words should be reported and the words have been reported to the committee and are now reported to the House for such action as the House may deem proper to take under the circumstances.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter, and I think we ought to have a quorum to hear about it, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum of the House is not present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Fess	Kettner	Riddick
Andrews, Md.	Fields	Kless	Riordan
Anthony	Flood	Kincheloe	Robison, Ky.
Ashbrook	Focht	Kreider	Rodenberg
Bakka	Fordney	LaGuardia	Rogers
Bacharach	Frear	Langley	Rouse
Barkley	Fuller, Ill.	Lebach	Rowan
Bell	Fuller, Mass.	Leshner	Rowe
Boies	Gallivan	Little	Sabath
Booher	Gandy	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Bowers	Gandy	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.
Britten	Gard	Lufkin	Sanford
Brooks, Pa.	Garland	McClintie	Saunders, Va.
Browne	Garner	McCulloch	Schall
Browning	Godwin, N. C.	McGlennon	Scully
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Sherwood
Butler	Good	McKown	Shreve
Caldwell	Goodall	McKinley	Siegel
Campbell, Kans.	Goodwin, Ark.	McLane	Sinclair
Cantrill	Goodykoontz	MacCrate	Sisson
Carew	Gould	Magee	Slemp
Carter	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Casey	Greene, Mass.	Major	Snell
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Mann, Ill.	Snyder
Clark, Mo.	Griffin	Martin	Steele
Cleary	Hamill	Mason	Stephens, Miss.
Cole	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Strong, Pa.
Cooper	Harrison	Mead	Sullivan
Copley	Haskell	Minahan, N. J.	Swope
Costello	Hawley	Montague	Tague
Crago	Hayden	Mooney	Taylor, Ark.
Crowther	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Cullen	Heflin	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Tenn.
Curry, Calif.	Hersman	Moore, Va.	Temple
Dallinger	Hicks	Moore, Ind.	Thomas
Darrow	Hill	Morin	Tincher
Davey	Holland	Mott	Tinkham
Davis, Minn.	Houghton	Mudd	Treadway
Davis, Tenn.	Howard	Neely	Vare
Dempsey	Hutings	Nicholls, S. C.	Venable
Denison	Hull, Iowa	Nolan	Walsh
Dent	Husted	O'Connell	Walters
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Ogden	Ward
Donovan	Ireland	Olney	Watson, Pa.
Dooling	Jeffers	Paige	Wellington
Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	Parker	Welling
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pell	Welty
Drane	Johnson, Wash.	Peters	Wheeler
Dunn	Johnson, N. Y.	Porter	Wilson, Pa.
Eagan	Jones, Pa.	Pou	Winslow
Eagle	Kahn	Radcliffe	Wise
Edmonds	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Emerson	Kelley, Pa.	Rainey, J. W.	Woodward
Esch	Kendall	Ramsey	Yates
Evans, Nebr.	Kennedy, Iowa	Reber	Zihlman
Ferris	Kennedy, R. I.	Reed, N. Y.	

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there not being a quorum present, I move the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There has been no announcement that there was not a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the Speaker if there is a quorum present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms was directed to notify absent Members, and the Chair has made no announcement of the result.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Can the gentleman from Texas interrupt the roll call?

Mr. KNUTSON. He can not.

Mr. BURKE. Let him take his seat, then.

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection is it not in order to move that the House adjourn at any time?

Mr. BURKE. Sit down.

Mr. BLANTON. You sit down, yourself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ascertain whether or not there is a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will take his seat.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not in order for a Member of this House at any time to move for the House to adjourn?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not until the roll call is completed and it is ascertained whether there is a quorum present or not.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish to be protected from the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, who is butting in all the time.

Mr. CANNON. Will the Chair permit me to make a suggestion? Until the vote is announced by the Speaker nothing is in order.

Mr. CRISP. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to differ with my distinguished friend, the ex-Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not until the roll call is completed.

Mr. CRISP. I insist that I have a right to be heard on the point of order. Under the rules of the House, which you adopted for your procedure, if there is no quorum present there is but one of two things you can do, adjourn or take steps to get a quorum, and it is always in order to adjourn when no quorum is present. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker can not stand there and refuse to announce whether or not a quorum is present and keep this House indefinitely in session. The House has a right to vote whether or not it will adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct in his statement of the rule, but his position as applied to the present premises is not well taken. The Clerk has not yet handed the Chair the report of the roll call. The Chair was waiting for the tally clerks to complete their count. Therefore, the point of order of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is premature. On this roll call 207 gentlemen have answered to their names, not a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn; and there were—yeas 98, nays 114, answered "present" 8, not voting 212, as follows:

YEAS—98.			
Alexander	Crisp	Lea, Calif.	Rubey
Almon	Davis, Tenn.	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Ayres	Dickinson, Mo.	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Bankhead	Domlnick	Lougaran	Small
Bee	Dupré	McAndrews	Smithwick
Benson	Evans, Mont.	McDuffie	Stoll
Black	Evans, Nev.	Major	Steagall
Blackmon	Fisher	Mann, S. C.	Steman
Bland, Mo.	Gallagher	Mansfield	Summers, Tex.
Bland, Va.	Garrett	Moon	Tillman
Blanton	Hastings	Nealon, Mo.	Upshaw
Box	Howard	O'Connor	Venable
Brand	Huddleston	Oldfield	Vinson
Briggs	Hudspeth	Oliver	Watkins
Brinton	Hull, Tenn.	Olney	Watson, Va.
Buchanan	Humphreys	Over, reet	Weaver
Byrnes, S. C.	Igoe	Padgett	Webb
Byrns, Tenn.	Jacoway	Paige	Whaley
Campbell, Pa.	Johnson, Miss.	Parrish	Wilson, La.
Candler	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Wingo
Caraway	Kitchin	Rainey, Ala.	Woods, Va.
Carss	Lanham	Raker	Wright
Coady	Lankford	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Collier	Larsen	Robinson, N. C.	
Connally	Lazaro	Romjue	

NAYS—114.			
Anderson	Elliott	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Mo.
Andrews, Nebr.	Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Nichols, Mich.
Baer	Elston	Kleczka	Ossoline
Barbour	Esch	Knutson	Platt
Begg	Fairfield	Kraus	Purnell
Benham	Foster	Lampert	Ramseyer
Bland, Ind.	Freeman	Layton	Randall, Calif.
Brooks, Ill.	French	Luhning	Randall, Wis.
Browne	Glynn	McArthur	Reavis
Burack	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Reed, W. Va.
Burke	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Rhodes
Burrhoughs	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Ricketts
Cannon	Hamilton	McPherson	Rose
Chindblom	Haruy, Colo.	MacGregor	Sanford
Christopherson	Haugen	Madden	Scott
Claason	Hays	Mapes	Sells
Cramton	Hernandez	Merritt	Sinnett
Currie, Mich.	Hersey	Miller	Smith, Idaho
Dale	Hickey	Morgan	Smith, Ill.
Denison	Hoch	Morgan, Wis.	Smith, Mich.
Dowell	Hull, Iowa	Mondell	Steenerson
Dunbar	James	Morgan	Stephens, Ohio
Dyer	Kearns	Nelson, Wis.	Stines
Echols	Keller	Newton, Minn.	Strong, Kans.

Summers, Wash.	Towner	Webster	Wood, Ind.
Sweet	Valle	Wheeler	Yates
Thompson	Vestal	White, Kans.	Young, N. Dak.
Tilson	Volstead	White, Me.	
Timberlake	Wason	Williams	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Aswell	King	Sanders, Ind.	Stevenson
Copley	Phelan	Sears	Wilson, Ill.

NOT VOTING—212.

Ackerman	Fields	Kettner	Ramsey
Andrews, Md.	Flood	Kiess	Reber
Anthony	Focht	Kincheloe	Reed, N. Y.
Ashbrook	Fordney	Kreider	Riddick
Babka	Frear	LaGuardia	Riordan
Bacharach	Fuller, Ill.	Langley	Robson, Ky.
Barkley	Fuller, Mass.	Lehbach	Rodenberg
Bell	Gallivan	Lesher	Rogers
Boies	Gandy	Little	Rouse
Booher	Ganly	Longworth	Rowan
Bowers	Gard	Luce	Rowe
Britten	Garland	Lufkin	Sabath
Brooks, Pa.	Garner	McClintic	Sanders, N. Y.
Browning	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Saunders, Va.
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	McGlennnon	Schall
Butler	Good	McKenzie	Scully
Caldwell	Goodall	McKeown	Sherwood
Campbell, Kans.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKiniry	Shreve
Cantrill	Goodykoontz	McLane	Siegel
Carew	Gould	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sims
Carter	Graham, Pa.	MacCrate	Sinclair
Casey	Graham, Ill.	Magee	Sisson
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Mass.	Maher	Slemp
Clark, Mo.	Griest	Mann, Ill.	Smith, N. Y.
Cleary	Griffin	Martin	Snell
Cole	Hamill	Mason	Snyder
Cooper	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Steele
Costello	Harrison	Mead	Stephens, Miss.
Crago	Haskell	Minahan, N. J.	Strong, Pa.
Crowther	Hawley	Montague	Sullivan
Cullen	Hayden	Mooney	Swope
Curry, Calif.	Heblin	Moore, Ohio	Tague
Dallinger	Hersman	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ark.
Darrow	Hicks	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Colo.
Davey	Hill	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Tenn.
Davis, Minn.	Holland	Morin	Temple
Dempsey	Houghton	Mott	Thomas
Dent	Hulings	Mudd	Tincher
Dewalt	Husted	Murphy	Tinkham
Dickinson, Iowa	Hutchinson	Neely	Treadway
Donovan	Ireland	Nicholls, S. C.	Vare
Dooling	Jefferis	Nolan	Voigt
Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	O'Connell	Walsh
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ogden	Walters
Drane	Johnson, Wash.	Park	Ward
Dunn	Johnston, N. Y.	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Eagan	Jones, Pa.	Pell	Welling
Eagle	Juul	Peters	Welty
Edmonds	Kahn	Porter	Wilson, Pa.
Emerson	Kelley, Mich.	Pou	Winslow
Evans, Nebr.	Kendall	Radcliffe	Wise
Ferris	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, H. T.	Woodyard
Fess	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, J. W.	Zihlman

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. VOIGT with Mr. HARDY of Texas.
 Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. BUTLER with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. GARNER.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. TINCHER with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
 Mr. LUCE with Mr. THOMAS.
 Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. GALLIVAN.
 Mr. BOIES with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. DOUGHTON.
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. McCLINTIC.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. LESHER.
 Mr. KIESS with Mr. LARSEN.
 Mr. LaGUARDIA with Mr. KETTNER.
 Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. LITTLE with Mr. HOLLAND.
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. FESS with Mr. ROUSE.
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. HERSMAN.
 Mr. McKENZIE with Mr. HEFLIN.
 Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. HAYDEN.
 Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.
 Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. MOTT with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. FOCHT with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. WELTY.
 Mr. BOWERS with Mr. WELLING.
 Mr. BROWNING with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
 Mr. COLE with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
 Mr. FREAR with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
 Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. POU.
 Mr. GARLAND with Mr. PELL.
 Mr. GOOD with Mr. PARK.
 Mr. CRAGO with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. SISSON.
 Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. SIMS.
 Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. REED of New York with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. HASKELL with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. MONTAGUE.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. EAGAN.
 Mr. ROGERS with Mr. DRANE.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. DOREMUS.
 Mr. HICKS with Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey.
 Mr. HILL with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. MAYS.
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. IRELAND with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. McKINIRY.
 Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. SHREVE with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
 Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. DEWALT.
 Mr. SNELL with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. OGDEN with Mr. GARNER.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. McKEOWN.
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. GARD.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. McGLENNON.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CLEARY.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. CASEY.
 Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. CARTER.
 Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. CANTRILL.
 Mr. WALSH with Mr. CALDWELL.
 Mr. WALTERS with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. SHERWOOD.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
 Mr. WARD with Mr. BOOHER.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BARKLEY.
 Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. BABKA.
 Mr. SLEMP with Mr. ASHERBROOK.
 Mr. COPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present?
 Mr. COPLEY. I do not know whether I was. The gongs had not rung over in the House Office Building, and I was told that a vote was being taken while on the way over here.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will record the gentleman as present.
 Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker—
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 98, the nays are 115, answered "present" 7. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.
 Mr. KITCHIN. How many are present, Mr. Speaker?
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Seven answered "present."
 The nays have it, and the motion to adjourn is not agreed to.
 Mr. MONDELL rose.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend a moment. The Chair is informed by the clerks that in their haste in making the computations there may have been some error. The Chair will recall the announcement just made and give the clerks time to cast up.
 Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, can I change my vote at this time?
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The roll call is not yet completed. Yes.
 Mr. BRIGGS. I wish to change from "no" to "aye."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "present."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana will be recorded as "present." On this vote the yeas are 99, the nays are 114, answered "present" 8. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The nays have it, and the motion to adjourn is not agreed to. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, in my temporary absence from the Chamber, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] took the floor. On my return to the Chamber he was still talking. I asked that his words be taken down. The words that I asked to be taken down were as follows:

A week ago I went to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and asked his permission, bowing as I did to the autocratic rule established by him, that each ordinary Member must go and get on his knees and beg his permission—I went and asked him to speak for 35 minutes. He knew I wanted to reveal the rotten leadership of the Republican Party in this House, and he notified me personally that I could not speak on that subject. He knew also that the election occurs in Massachusetts to-morrow, and I was to expose the partisanship manifested by that examining committee against the Democratic candidate in Massachusetts. He refused to let me speak, and I notified him then and there that he would gain time by permitting me to speak even for only 35 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I move to strike those words from the Record, and for the following reasons: The facts are these: A week ago to-day—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has no right to state facts connected with his motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to strike out the words that I just read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the regular course the Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MONDELL moves to strike from the Record the following language:

"A week ago I went to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and asked his permission, bowing as I did to the autocratic rule, established by him, that each ordinary Member must go and get on his knees and beg his permission—I went and asked him to speak for 35 minutes. He knew I wanted to reveal the rotten leadership of the Republican Party in this House, and he notified me personally that I could not speak on that subject. He knew also that the election occurs in Massachusetts to-morrow, and I was to expose the partisanship manifested by that examining committee against the Democratic candidate in Massachusetts. He refused to let me speak, and I notified him then and there that he would gain time by permitting me to speak even for only 35 minutes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the facts in regard to this matter are as follows—

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to strike out debatable?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair so understands. Has the gentleman any authority to the contrary?

Mr. KITCHIN. My understanding is that it is not debatable.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is no such motion pending.

Mr. KITCHIN. To strike words from the Record; that is the motion there. He moves to strike those words from the Record. That is the very motion.

Mr. CRISP. If the Speaker will permit, I will read section 4 of Rule XIV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield or does the gentleman from Georgia make the point of order?

Mr. CRISP. I make the point of order, then, that it is not debatable, and in support of that I read section 4 of Rule XIV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. This is section 4 of Rule XIV:

If any Member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call him to order, in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another Member, to explain; and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate. If the decision is in favor of the Member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is not reading the rule in regard to striking out at all. He is reading another rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that he read section 5, the section immediately following.

Mr. CRISP. I will be delighted to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Sit down!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Who was telling me to sit down? Nobody but the Chair will tell me to sit down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mr. CRISP. Section 5 of Rule XIV reads as follows:

If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that gives him the right to debate, but on this proposition I submit that even if it is debatable the Chair must first decide whether the words constitute a breach of the rules of debate. Now, if the Chair decides that the words excepted to and taken down constitute a breach of the etiquette of the House and are unparliamentary, then the question is before the House as to what disposition the House will make of them. It seems to me under the rule read the motion is not debatable, but certainly it is not debatable by the gentleman from Wyoming or myself or anyone else until the Chair has first decided whether those words constitute a breach of the privileges of the House and are unparliamentary.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a motion to strike out has been debated in the House within a week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was going to call the attention of the House to that precedent. The Chair will hear the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. The word "debate" in section 5 of Rule XIV has no reference at all to this question; that is, whether the motion may be debated or not. That rule simply means that after a gentleman utters the offensive words, if a demand is not then made that the words be taken down, and if there is other debate or other business transacted, then you can not take down the words or censure the Member. That is what is meant by the words—

if further debate or other business has intervened—

and not what the Chair considers the words to mean.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a motion to strike out has been debated within a week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has that very precedent in mind, that within a week a motion of exactly the same kind has been made and debated in the House.

Mr. WINGO. Will the Chair permit this—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. I think this question arose once when Speaker CLARK was Speaker, and, as I recall, he ruled that you had to vote upon the motion at once. I make this suggestion to the Speaker, that if you hold that a motion to strike out words taken down in debate is debatable, then you open the floodgate for filibustering. Then if anything in the nature of partisan criticism is uttered in debate, a gentleman desiring to filibuster can demand in committee that the words be taken down. He can force the committee to rise, and then if, under the rules of the House, a motion to strike out the words is debatable, he can speak for one hour, and by repeated demands support at length a filibuster. It is true in some instances that the House has permitted debate without the point being made. It did it the other day, although I expected, as other gentlemen did, that the point of order would be made and debate shut off. I suggest to the Chair, as well as to the majority leader, that he is opening the door to possible trouble in the future.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wyoming on the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have not recently looked up the precedents, but I do know, as the gentleman from Arkansas admits, that it has been the practice of the House to debate a motion to strike out words uttered in debate. The only argument made by the gentleman from Arkansas is that it is a questionable practice. That may be. I grant you that if we spend a large part of our time on debate of that sort it would interfere with business. But I assume that gentlemen do not lightly demand that words spoken in debate shall be taken down, and the cases where that is done are very infrequent,

and where demand was made, as far as I can recall, debate has been had.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way under heaven whereby the House can intelligently pass upon a case of this sort unless there is some opportunity for debate.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. With the courtesy of the gentleman from Wyoming yielding, I would like to present this thought to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. What brings this matter before the Chair? Under what basis is the motion made to strike out? On the ground that it is unparliamentary. That is the only way the conduct of the gentleman from Louisiana is called in question at the bar of the House, because the mover of the motion to strike out says that he uttered words that were unparliamentary. It is not just or fair to the gentleman from Louisiana to have him up here with a motion to strike out his words unless he has violated some of the rules of the House. Therefore it seems to me that before the matter can be open for discussion, even if it is debatable, the Chair must decide whether the language is unparliamentary.

I grant you, Mr. Speaker, that there might be some debate on the question as to whether or not the words excepted to constitute a breach; but certainly, Mr. Speaker, there can not be any debate as to whether you will strike them out or any reason that led up to this controversy or any other question, save that one proposition, whether the words used in the Committee of the Whole by the gentleman from Louisiana are unparliamentary, and that is the motion pending before the Speaker. It seems to me that undoubtedly the Chair must decide that before you can proceed further with the motion to strike out the words.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair desires to be fortified in the matter, I am perfectly willing to say that the language used is, in my opinion, unparliamentary, if my opinion in the matter has any effect on the situation. I was about to explain why it was unparliamentary when I was interrupted by gentlemen on the other side, but evidently they do not want the truth.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words of the gentleman from Wyoming be taken down.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand that the words of the gentleman from Wyoming be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman from Georgia make a request?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman be taken down.

Mr. CRISP. I beg the Chair's pardon—did the Chair ask me a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman from Georgia make a request?

Mr. CRISP. I moved to take down the words of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to this effect, that gentlemen "on the other side" did not want the truth to appear.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman ought at least to quote me correctly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, under the rules, debate must cease, and the gentleman from Wyoming must take his seat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming will suspend. The gentleman from Georgia has asked that the words of the gentleman from Wyoming be taken down. The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman—

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming, under the circumstances, must, under the rules of the House, take his seat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming will suspend. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. BANKHEAD. To submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There being two motions pending to take down words, which takes priority of consideration under the rules?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I intend to withdraw my request to take down the words, and I do so. I simply made the request to show the gentleman from Wyoming how absurd and ridiculous his motion is to strike out the words of the gentleman from Louisiana, which are in effect the same as his words.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, that the words of the gentleman be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can not at this time have the words taken down as the request has been withdrawn by another gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Immediately upon the use of the words by the gentleman from Wyoming I rose and asked that they be taken down, and I renew that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia had meanwhile made a request and had debated it, so that the gentleman from Texas is too late.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Chair rule that only the gentleman from Georgia has the right to make such a request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia did make the request, and he made it ahead of the gentleman from Texas and was recognized. The matter was considered and withdrawn by him. In the opinion of the Chair, it now comes too late for the gentleman from Texas to make his demand.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the Chair holds that nobody else can make that demand?

Mr. GARRETT. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman from Texas will not insist upon having the words taken down—

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to have the Chair rule correctly.

Mr. GARRETT. But I respectfully dissent from the ruling of the Chair, because if some gentleman makes the point and then withdraws it, certainly the Chair would not hold that another Member could not renew the point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's contention would be correct in the case of a point of order, that any Member could make the point of order, but it seems to the Chair that if he permitted one Member after another to make such a demand it could go on indefinitely. It is a matter for the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down, and I ask the Chair to rule whether or not I am in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair rules that the gentleman is not in order at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the gentleman's appeal do lie on the table. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas demands a division.

The House divided, and the Chair counted 112 Members in the affirmative.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming that the appeal of the gentleman from Texas from the decision of the Chair do lie on the table. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 118, nays 96, answered "present" 7, not voting 211, as follows:

YEAS—118.

Anderson	Dyer	Hoch	Merritt
Andrews, Nebr.	Echols	Hull, Iowa	Michener
Baer	Elliott	James	Miller
Barbour	Ellsworth	Juul	Monahan, Wis.
Begg	Elston	Kahn	Mondell
Benham	Esch	Kearns	Morgan
Brooks, Ill.	Evans, Nebr.	Keller	Nelson, Wis.
Burdick	Fairfield	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Minn.
Burke	Foster	King	Newton, Mo.
Burroughs	Freeman	Kinkaid	Nichols, Mich.
Cannon	French	Klecza	Nolan
Chindblom	Glynn	Knutson	Osborne
Christopherson	Goodykoontz	Kraus	Platt
Classon	Green, Iowa	Lampert	Parnell
Copley	Greene, Vt.	Layton	Ramseyer
Cramton	Hadley	Lubling	Randall, Wis.
Currie, Mich.	Hamilton	McFadden	Reavis
Dale	Hardy, Colo.	McKinley	Reed, W. Va.
Denison	Hays	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rhodes
Dickinson, Iowa	Hernandez	McPherson	Ricketts
Dowell	Hersey	Madden	Rose
Dunbar	Hickey	Mapes	Sanders, Ind.

Scott	Stiness	Towner	White, Me.
Sells	Strong, Kans.	Vaile	Williams
Sinnott	Summers, Wash.	Vestal	Wilson, Ill.
Smith, Idaho	Sweet	Volstead	Wood, Ind.
Smith, Ill.	Taylor, Tenn.	Wason	Yates
Smith, Mich.	Thompson	Webster	Young, N. Dak.
Steenerson	Tilson	Wheeler	
Stephens, Ohio	Timberlake	White, Kans.	

NAYS—96.

Alexander	Davis, Tenn.	Lazaro	Robinson, N. C.
Almon	Dent	Lee, Ga.	Romjue
Aswell	Dickinson, Mo.	Lithicum	Rubey
Bankhead	Dominick	McAndrews	Rucker
Bee	Dupré	McDuffie	Sanders, La.
Black	Evans, Mont.	Major	Sanford
Blackmon	Fisher	Mann, S. C.	Small
Brand, Va.	Gallagher	Mansfield	Smithwick
Blanton	Garrett	Martin	Stoll
Box	Hastings	Mays	Stegall
Brand	Hayden	Moon	Stedman
Briggs	Hersman	Nelson, Mo.	Stevenson
Brinson	Howard	O'Connor	Summers, Tex.
Buchanan	Hudspeth	Oldfield	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver	Upsaw
Byrns, Tenn.	Humphreys	Overstreet	Venable
Campbell, Pa.	Igoe	Padgett	Watkins
Candler	Jacoway	Park	Watson, Va.
Caraway	Johnson, Miss.	Parrish	Weaver
Carss	Jones, Tex.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Coady	Kitchin	Quin	Wingo
Collier	Lanham	Rainey, Ala.	Woods, Va.
Connally	Lankford	Raker	Wright
Crisp	Larsen	Ravburn	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bland, Ind.	Huddleston	Loneragan	Whaley
Haugen	Lea, Calif.	Sears	

NOT VOTING—211.

Ackerman	Ferris	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews, Md.	Fess	LaGuardia	Riddick
Anthony	Fields	Langley	R'ordan
Ashbrook	Flood	Lehlbach	Robison, Ky.
Ayres	Focht	Leshner	Rodenberg
Babka	Fordney	Little	Rogers
Bacharach	Frear	Longworth	Rouse
Barkley	Fuller, Ill.	Luce	Rowan
Bell	Fuller, Mass.	Lufkin	Rowe
Benson	Gallivan	McArthur	Sabath
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McClintic	Sanders, N. Y.
Boles	Ganly	McCulloch	Saunders, Va.
Booher	Gard	McGlennon	Schall
Bowers	Garland	McKenzie	Scully
Britten	Garner	McKeown	Sherwood
Brooks, Pa.	Godwin, N. C.	McKiniry	Shreve
Browne	Goldfogle	McLane	Siegel
Browning	Good	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sims
Brumbaugh	Goodall	MacCrate	Sinclair
Butler	Goodwin, Ark.	MacGregor	Sisson
Caldwell	Gould	Magee	Slemp
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Mann, Ill.	Snell
Carew	Greene, Mass.	Mason	Snyder
Carter	Griest	Mead	Steele
Casey	Griffin	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Hardy, Tex.	Mooney	Sullivan
Cleary	Harrison	Moore, Ohio	Swope
Cole	Haskell	Moore, Pa.	Tague
Cooper	Hawley	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Ark.
Costello	Hedlin	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Hicks	Morin	Temple
Crowther	Hill	Mott	Thomas
Cullen	Holland	Mudd	Timcher
Curry, Calif.	Houghton	Murphy	Tinkham
Dallinger	Hulings	Neely	Treadway
Darrow	Husted	Nicholls, S. C.	Vare
Davey	Hutchinson	O'Connell	Vinson
Davis, Minn.	Ireland	Ogden	Voigt
Dempsey	Jefferis	Olney	Walsh
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Palge	Walters
Donovan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker	Ward
Dooling	Johnson, Wash.	Pell	Watson, Pa.
Doremus	Johnson, N. Y.	Peters	Webb
Doughton	Jones, Pa.	Porter	Wellington
Drane	Kelley, Mich.	Pou	Welty
Dunn	Kendall	Radeliffe	Wilson, Pa.
Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, H. T.	Winslow
Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Edmonds	Kettner	Ramsey	Woodyard
Emerson	Kless	Randall, Calif.	Zihlman
Evans, Nev.	Kincheloe	Reber	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. KIESS with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. VINSON.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. ROUSE.

Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, is a quorum present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To submit a request. In order to save the House a further discussion of the point of order, I ask unanimous consent that I may discuss the matter under consideration for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to be permitted to discuss the matter for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have five minutes following.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] have five minutes after the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. CANNON. And that both of them speak to the matter before the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. And remain in order while they are speaking. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, in that case I ask that I may have a minute of my five minutes after the gentleman from Louisiana has spoken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification to that extent? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the words that I moved to have stricken out have been read to the House, and by this time are familiar to all of the gentlemen. In his statement the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] said:

He—

Speaking of me—

knew I wanted to reveal the rotten leadership of the Republican Party in the House, and he notified me personally that I could not speak on that subject.

The facts are that on Monday, a week ago to-day, the gentleman from Louisiana, without any previous statement to me whatever, and on being recognized, asked unanimous consent to address the House for 35 minutes on the following Saturday. He was informed that he was not recognized for that purpose. Whereupon, a little later, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] came to my seat and further expressed a desire to speak. He gave no intimation or suggestion of the subject of his address. I told him that I could not at this time of the session agree to a special order for speeches at a specified time, owing to the desire of the House to dispatch the public business before it; but that no doubt abundant opportunity would be given him in the course of debate. There has been debate to-day, controlled on his side, which could have been yielded to him, and in which time he could have discussed the matter that he desires to discuss. In fact the statement he made to which I object was made in time so yielded him. That is the only conversation I have ever had with the gentleman from Louisiana on the subject of his speech. I had not the slightest idea of the subject of his speech. I knew nothing about it; had no intimation of its character, when I objected this morning, because there was a matter of great importance before the House. And the gentleman was not justified in impugning my motives as he did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on the 20th of October I introduced a series of resolutions in this House calling upon the various investigating committees to report money and time expended to date. At that time I gave out an interview, which was carried in practically every newspaper of the country, criticizing the Republican leaders of this House, and particularly with regard to failing to do anything for the soldiers, and containing a reference to these investigations. That was carried everywhere. On last Monday I addressed the Speaker. He recognized me. I asked unanimous consent to speak Saturday. The Speaker said that he did not recognize me for that purpose. I immediately went to the Speaker's desk personally and asked what the trouble was, and he said that I had not spoken to him in advance, and then he asked me on what subject. I told him frankly that I proposed to speak on war expenditures and this Congress. He smiled pleasantly and said, "You best see MONDELL." Later on I went to Mr. MONDELL and, I repeat, very humbly, as Members have to do, I asked him if I might not speak. He said, "No." Now, the facts had been carried through the press; they had been told about the House; my purpose had been heralded throughout the country, and I assumed that the majority leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], knew. I did not

have the slightest doubt from his manner. He should have known and I assumed that he knew.

And now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, the criticisms I have made to-night have been so clearly demonstrated in the last two hours by ocular demonstration to everybody in the House and in the galleries that I have nothing more to say. It is proven by the conduct here of Republican leaders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming has two minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House has the right to impugn the motives of another Member. I say again that I had no intimation, I had no thought, of the subject of the gentleman's discussion. I said to him, as I have said to all others, that, in my opinion, it was not wise at this time to fix a time at a future date when a gentleman would be entitled to take up time that might be needed for the transaction of the public business. The gentleman from Louisiana might have received time to-day from the other side—time that was available.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Does not the gentleman recall that the time on both sides of the discussion for these two days has been controlled by two gentlemen on his side of the House, Mr. PLATT and Mr. KING?

Mr. MONDELL. No.

Mr. ASWELL. That is true.

Mr. MONDELL. By the arrangement that was finally made one-third of the time was given to that side. The gentleman did get five minutes of that time.

Mr. ASWELL. The debate on the bill—

Mr. MONDELL. The gentlemen in charge of the time may have had their time already apportioned and may have made promises. I do not want to be unfair to them. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must not say that gentlemen are denied the opportunity to speak because of any objection I have to the subject matter of their speeches. I certainly shall never object to any proper parliamentary address on this floor because I do not approve of the subject matter of a speech. I had no intimation as to the subject the gentleman proposed to discuss. I followed the rule that I have followed heretofore, to which no exception has been made, except in the case of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], who, by reason of his age and his long and honorable Army service and his long, distinguished service in this House, I believed was entitled to that consideration. I treated the gentleman from Louisiana just as I have other gentlemen on both sides. I knew nothing of the character of his proposed speech or what he intended to talk about. With this explanation, I have no objection to the words he uttered remaining in the Record. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his motion?

Mr. MONDELL. I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his motion.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until Wednesday, November 5, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting certain schedules of useless papers in the files of the commission and requesting that appropriate action be taken to grant permission to destroy same (H. Doc. No. 285); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce for field expenses of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 286); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to amend section 4881 of the Revised Statutes, relating to national cemeteries (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on survey and flood

control of the Atchafalaya River, La., and related basins (H. Doc. No. 288); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10208) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the city of Decatur, Ala., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 440), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, from the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 362) providing for the distribution and sale of surplus Army motor vehicles, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 441), which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SANFORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8290) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 442), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 10346) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Farmington, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 10347) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Baldwin, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10348) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10349) authorizing the acquisition of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Greybull, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) for the appointment of a committee from the Members of the House and Senate to meet the ship bearing the first bodies of American soldiers from the field of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRISP: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Georgia for creation of a national park in Georgia; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10350) granting an increase of pension to George W. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 10351) granting an increase of pension to Emily E. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 10352) granting an increase of pension to Jean R. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10353) granting a pension to Ezra P. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10354) for the relief of Marion H. Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 10355) to authorize the President, when Maj. Gen. Leonard D. Wood retires, to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10356) granting a pension to Joseph P. Flanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 10357) granting an increase of pension to James A. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 10358) for the relief of John R. Monteith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10359) for the relief of Seth J. Harris, Jimmie Lou Martin, Mary Holloman, and William Henry Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10360) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Lanham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 10361) granting a pension to John Beehane; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 10362) granting an increase of pension to David F. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10363) for the reinstatement of Woodbury F. Pride in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 10364) granting a pension to Annie G. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Freight Handlers of Arkansas, opposing laws discriminating against the colored race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Akron Jewish organizations, urging United States to use its power to protect the people of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade in opposition to Senate bill 1469, for the creation of a Federal home loan board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Western Wisconsin Teachers' Association, supporting the league of nations and peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Ninetieth Division Association for reasonable universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Bainbridge Branch, Dairyman's League, at Bainbridge, N. J., favoring the passage of the so-called "Capper-Hersman bill" to legalize collective bargaining by farmers' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Friends of Irish Freedom of Hartford, Conn., for self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of California State Federation of Labor, protesting against Cummins bill and urging its defeat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, urging that independence be given to the Philippines as soon as they are able to govern themselves; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, urging adequate compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, endorsing the Sterling-Lehlbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, protesting against the award of large contracts by the Navy Department to the Columbia Steel Co. and urging that they be given to the Mare Island Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, protesting against aggression by this country against Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Gantner & Mattern Co., Marvin-Williams Co., Keystone Bros., and Eloesser-Heynemann Co., all of San Francisco, Calif., opposing House bill 8315; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, favoring increased pay for enlisted men of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of National Initiative and Referendum League of New York City, supporting Senate joint resolution 22 and House joint resolution 60 and forwarding article from New York Post entitled "Justice for Coxey"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Civic League, favoring granting military rank to Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Law and Order Union of New York, protesting against unlimited income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of general organization committee of railroad employees, supporting Plumb plan of railroad control and opposing Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pneumatic Scale Corporation (Ltd.), of Norfolk Downs, Mass., urging consideration of their metal container; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Ninetieth Division Association, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor, opposing Senate bill 2788 and the Gulick plan of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of California State Federation of Labor; California Parlor, No. 161, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of Amador City; Naomi Parlor, No. 36, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of Downville; Columbia Parlor, No. 256, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Columbia, all in the State of California, opposing oriental immigration to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. Rowan: Resolutions of the Ninetieth Division Association of Dallas, Tex., in favor of a reasonable amount of universal military training, not exceeding one year, and an adequate Regular Army as a nucleus for the proper training of its citizens for military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Dr. Emil G. Beck, of Chicago, Ill., with suggestions for the advocates and adversaries to the league of nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, November 4, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, November 3, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	McKellar	Simmons
Ball	Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Smoot
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Sterling
Cummins	Kellogg	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Nugent	Thomas
Dial	Kenyon	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	Keyes	Owens	Trammell
Elkins	King	Page	Underwood
Gay	Kirby	Phelps	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Knox	Pittman	Watson
Gore	La Follette	Poindexter	Williams
Gronna	Lenroot	Ransdell	Wolcott
Hale	Lodge	Sheppard	
Harding	McCormick	Sherman	
Harrison	McCumber	Shields	

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] are detained from the Senate by illness. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness in his family, and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is in Massachusetts to vote at the State elections.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.